A

COMPREHENSIVE VIEW

OF THE

VARIOUS CONTROVERSIES

AMONG

Pagans, Mahometans, Jews, and Christians.

PHILOSOPHICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

In which is shewn,

I. Wherein the various parties agree.
II. Wherein they differ.
III. The differences adjusted, and the absurd opinions and parties refuted.

BEING

A COMPENDIOUS POLEMICAL SYSTEM.

Errare possum; haereticus esse nolo. *Aug.*
Humanum est errare; sed perseverare in errare diabolicum. *S.*
Age nunc quod moriturus agas. *M.*

BY THE AUTHOR OF THE DESIGN OF CREATION.

EDINBURGH:
Printed in the Year 1785.

445
9

PREFACE.

I Have always thought, that laymen, and eſpecially lawyers, are the moſt proper perſons to treat controverſies; not only becauſe a lawyer's buſineſs conſiſts chiefly in controverſy of its kind, and being moſtly accuſtomed to ſubjects of this nature, they are therefore ſuppoſed to be the beſt logicians, but becauſe that laymen, being neutral with regard to intereſt, are therefore ſuppoſed to be more impartial inquirers for truth, and more equal judges in ſome controverſies; whereas clergymen, in ſome caſes, are at leaſt more liable to be ſuſpected of acting from intereſt more than principle, however candid they may be, and therefore contending for victory more than for truth; which is the caſe with too many of all denominations. Being wholly neutral with regard to intereſt, I hope to eſcape the imputation of partiality, or at leaſt to give no reaſon for it, but to exerciſe juſtice and moderation, or a moderate juſtice. When the philoſopher heard ſome narrow-minded bigots, and home-bred little ſpirits, commend their own country, and condemn all others, he ſaid he conſidered himſelf as a citizen of no particular country, but of the world at large. So, like that philoſopher, I conſider myſelf as a citizen of the world, and of the whole church of God in it. No party is without both properties and faults, though the faults of ſome be greater and more numerous than thoſe of others. I approve of what is good, and diſapprove of what is bad

in every party; and hope to ſhew, that I ſee the faults and properties of all parties equally, and am entirely freed from the prejudices of education; which are like chains and fetters, that hold too many all their lifetime ſubject to wretched and miſerable bondage. The faults of others are certainly their calamities and misfortunes, though they are too often voluntary, and therefore ſhould excite pity rather than ſeverity.

Polemical writers ſeldom ſhew wherein other parties are right, and wherein they agree with them, but take notice only of their faults, as if they had no properties, which I reckon a great injuſtice done them; and therefore, to avoid this defect, I take a more liberal view, and a more extenſive plan; which leads me to conſider, not only the differences among Chriſtians, but alſo among Pagans, &c.; for the Pagan philoſophers were divided into different parties, and held different opinions, as well as Jews and Chriſtians; and they all differed more about words than things, miſunderſtanding one another's meaning by affixing different ideas to the ſame words; ſo that the wars and diſputations of moſt of them are only logomachies, and they may all be reduced to bigots and ſceptics.

A bigot is a heretic in the higheſt ſenſe; he is one that holds whatever opinion he has learned, or formed, without conſidering and examining whether it is right or wrong, or weighing and comparing both ſides of the queſtion: he will keep his principle, be it true or falſe; and it is the ſame to him which of them it is, as he holds it not on a rational and juſt foundation,

being perſuaded he cannot err; or unwilling to change and give up with his opinion or way, he is not open to conviction, but obſtinate in his error, and reſolved to perſevere in it, and is the moſt deſpicable diſagreeable being in nature.

Auguſtine diſtinguiſhes between error and hereſy thus: I may err, but I will not be a heretic; to err is human, but to perſevere in it is diabolical; to ſuch is addreſſed the golden maxim, Act now as you would do when dying, or, as you will wiſh to have done when you come to die.

A ſceptic is one that is in ſuſpence, and indifferent between truth and error; and either doubts, whether there be ſuch a thing as truth, or whether we can certainly attain to the knowledge of it; he therefore doubts of every thing, and holds this as his only certain principle, that nothing is certain; but then he contradicts himſelf, in holding this one thing for certain, that nothing is certain, and making it a certain principle. Pyrrho, the father of them, did not believe his ſenſes; but his friends were ſo attentive, as to prevent him from going over a precipice, or into fire or water; and he has had ſome genuine diſciples of late, who diſbelieve that there is a material world, but only an idea of it in the mind, without an archetype, which is an impoſſibility; and that there is neither matter nor ſpirit, and nothing but impreſſions and ideas in nature; a phyloſophic delirium. Bigotry and ſcepticiſm are equal extremes; and it is a miſtake to ſay, ſuch is the ſafe ſide to err on, for all extremes are equally dangerous; but man is made

With too much knowledge for the ſceptic's ſide,
With too much weakneſs for the bigot's pride.

—If a perſon wiſh to ſee the arguments light on any ſide of a queſtion, they will appear ſo to him.—The prejudice of education leads the bulk of mankind, and not reaſon: prejudice is an opinion formed either for or againſt a thing, before it be rightly examined and underſtood; and it is an immenſe labour, even with the help of a learned education, to remove ſuch prejudices, either in the natural, the civil, or religious life. Mankind are generally prejudiſed in favour of their native country and cuſtoms, as well as their religion; and we commonly ſay, it is natural for them to be ſo. Cuſtom becomes as it were a ſecond nature, and is apt to be miſtaken for nature herſelf.

Whatever principles or notions are firſt inſtilled into the mind, are ſeldom eradicated afterwards; and ſcarce any other country, cuſtoms, or religion, ever become quite agreeable, or familiar, to ſuch as have forſaken their native ones, even though convinced of their ſuperiority, or of the abſurdity of their native religion, and quit it on that account; yet they ſeldom heartily adopt another, but remain ſceptics, except where enthuſiaſm takes place; and then they will turn from the beſt to the worſt, or, on the contrary; and from one party to another, or make a diviſion without any material difference, and yet imagine it as great as that between light and darkneſs; ſo that a true and rational reformation is either a miracle or ſimilar to it, as was the caſe in the propagation of Chriſtianity and the reformation. So great is the power of cuſ-

tom and education, and ſo weak is reaſon, or the powers and faculties of the human mind in the preſent ſtate. So that a right education is of the utmoſt importance both in principles and morals. Unſkilful nurſes, in order to prevent children from going into dark places, where they may ſtumble and fall, often perſuade them that there are hobgoblins and ghoſts in the dark; and thus inſtill into their minds a fear of ſpirits when it is dark, ſo that they remain under that bondage through life; whereas ſpirits, being inviſible, are no more in the dark than in the light. No part of literature is perhaps worſe conducted than that of controverſy; the volumes on almoſt each one are either ſo many or ſo large, that, being diſguſted at the very appearance of them, few cultivate a right acquaintance with the principal controverſies, or the principal points in any one controverſy, and the indolent neglect them altogether; though the danger of hereſy and ſchiſm is neceſſary to be known, in order to avoid them.—When writings were ſcarce in the world, or in any particular language, they were peruſed with unwearied diligence; and the more large or diffuſe any were in ſpeaking or writing in theſe days of voluntary ſlavery, they were ſuppoſed to have the more merit; but the world is now got into the Grecian laconic and right taſte in that point, to value writers and ſpeakers for being ſhort and ſubſtantial, to comprehend a ſea of matter in a drop of language; and it is a fact, that a laconic, or conciſe writer or ſpeaker, will ſay more in a pamphlet, or in half an hour, than a tedious diffuſe one will do in a folio or in half a day: brevity ſometimes cauſes

obſcurity, but prolixity always does ſo; there is no being diffuſe without confuſion. To be long and loud in writing and ſpeaking, are certain ſigns of the want of merit, in order to make up in bulk or ſound what is wanting in ſubſtance. If every book were reduced to its quinteſſence, many folios would be reduced to pamphlets, and many an author's works would be loſt altogether. Folios, or many volumes, in either hiſtory or ſcience, might well be ſummed up in pamphlets, and reduced to a ſmall number, and then great expence of money, time, and labour would be ſaved.—All that any can learn by reading ſome books, even on the chief ſubjects of literature, is, that they loſt all the foreſaid expences. How much more is it the caſe with regard to thoſe that can have no ſolid uſeful knowledge to enlighten or enrich the mind!

It is not my intention to treat univerſally of all the controverſies, or all the points of any one; as ſome controverſies are of no importance, and many things controverted in almoſt each one. Some are as much deliriums as hereſies. It is only the principal controverſies, and the important points in theſe I intend to treat. It is certain, that, as an argument, or an admonition, multiplies in words, it loſes in weight; and the caſe is the ſame with regard to arguments on a controverſy. I ſhall therefore make my arguments ſhort and few. When one ſufficiently overthrows an abſurdity, more are needleſs. As I intend my publications for general uſe, I ſtudy to be ſhort and plain; for the benefit of thoſe that have little time or money, and for the weak and ignorant. I intend this not only for an introduction to the

ſtudy of controverſy at the Univerſity, in order to perform what I promiſed ſome years ago, of reducing the ſubſtance of all the controverſies to a ſmall compaſs, for the benefit of ſtudents, but alſo for the illiterate.

All abſurdities and corruptions are reduced to three kinds, *viz.* hereſy, ſchiſm, profaneneſs. Hereſy is a word of Greek original, and ſignifies an election, or choice of an opinion or way; taken up, not from the evidence of truth, but for affected ſingularity, and ſiniſter deſigns; a party-buſineſs, oppoſite to the common good, *viz.* unity and concord for worldy intereſt, or a diviſion from contention and diſcord. The ſame Greek word in the New Teſtament is rendered both hereſy and ſect, Acts v. 17. xv. 5. xxv. 5, 14. xxvi. 5. xxviii. 22. 1 Cor. xi. 19. Gal. v. 19. Jude ver. 6. So that hereſy is either ſpeculative in opinion, ſectarian in ſociety, or practical in converſation. Oppoſite to truth, unity, and morality, it is the adhering or cleaving faſt to any abſurdity or error in principle or practice. Orthodoxy is a right opinion or principle; and heterodoxy is another, or different opinion, oppoſite to the right one, that is an erroneous one, and coincides with hereſy. Canonical is what is infallible, or an unerring rule, as the inſpired writings. In the ſecondary ſenſe, it alſo ſignifies what is eſtabliſhed by public authority as a law. And as the church of Rome claims infallibility, ſhe calls every thing ſhe does canonical, as the eſtabliſhing laws, days, and hours for worſhip, ſaints for adoration, to be invoked as mediators, *&c.*

INTRODUCTION.

A Rational Inquiry concerning Truth in Matters of Religion.

(Some of the beaſts have certain degrees of reaſon, as the elephant, which is called half-rational by philoſophers: and the beavers build their habitation with much art and deſign, as Father Bougeant, on the language of brutes, obſerves; they have alſo a language, and underſtand one another; and ſome of them have the power of imitation, to learn artificial language from man, and notes of muſic; but they have not ſo much as to make them capable of religion, for they want the ſenſe of right and wrong, or of moral good and evil, called conſcience, or the moral ſenſe, and therefore are not moral agents, or accountable for their conduct.)

21 JY 64

MAN, ſtrictly ſpeaking, is properly denominated a religious creature, as diſtinguiſhed from the brutes; as all nations had deities, religious worſhip, and oracles.

When I attained to the years of diſcretion, and became capable to exerciſe reaſon, (ſays the philoſopher) I began to examine which of the four religions is the true one, and which is the true church. I did not take it for granted, that the religion and church I was bred in was the

right one, becauſe it ſays ſo, for every one does that. I obſerved, that the bulk of mankind continue to hold faſt to the religion and cuſtoms with which they were brought up; and as many of theſe are contrary to one another, they cannot all be right. Many miſtake cuſtom and education for truth, and the prejudice of education ſerves to rivet them in their errors; nor can they give any reaſon why they hold ſuch cuſtoms and religion, but that they were brought up with them; and therefore they are right, and all others wrong: and both churchmen and ſtateſmen, led by political motives, confirm them in theſe opinions to their hurt and ruin.

I therefore obſerved, that the firſt thing to be done is to unlearn falſe principles, or the prejudices of education, and, for this end, to follow the rules that God has given us rather than men; for Pagans, or Deiſts, Mahometans, Jews, and Chriſtians, and every party of theſe affirm they only are right.

We have three rules to judge what is right or wrong by, each for their proper objects, viz. Our bodily ſenſes, our reaſon, and revelation; and theſe cannot contradict one another, for God is the author of them all, and he cannot be the author of contradictions. Scripture doctrines are above the diſcovery of reaſon, but when they are revealed, they cannot be contrary to it. It is by our reaſon we muſt judge what are the marks and evidences of a revelation from God, and whether the Koran of Mahomet, or the Old and New Teſtament be divine oracles. And it is our reaſon that makes us capable of religion.

If we give up with our reaſon, or follow not the dictates of it, we are no better than brutes that act by inſtinct; and if we give up with our ſenſes, or do not believe them, we are worſe; and yet we muſt give up with both, and revelation too, if we worſhip creatures and artificial workmanſhip, or admit of tranſubſtantiation, and worſhip performed in an unknown tongue; or think that creatures are omnipreſent, as the addreſſing them at the ſame time in diſtant places ſuppoſes, or make a diviſion without any material difference; and whatever elſe is evidently abſurd to the common ſenſe of mankind. Can any believe that ſnow is black, that honey is bitter, and gall ſweet? that fire is cold, and ice hot? that a part of any thing is equal to the whole of it, whoever may affirm it? No perſon, church, or nation, is allowed to be a judge in their own cauſe; for they would juſtify themſelves, and condemn their opponents, Prov. xviii. 17.

The Jews have ſtrictly obſerved the conduct of the Chriſtian church in all periods, and they are neutral and proper judges if ſhe has changed from her primitive ſtate, and whether the Greek, the Roman, or the reformed churches, Popery, Prelacy, Preſbytery, or Independency be neareſt the original model. Money made the difference; covetouſneſs and ambition bred corruption.

Great allowances are to be made for the prejudices of education; they affect the mind as the jaundice does the eye, ſo that it ſees all things of its own complexion.

The mental proſpect magnifies the faults of others with the one end, and diminiſhes its own with the other.

We ſhould beware of judging that the faults of others ſeem as great to them as to us: if they appeared ſo, they would indeed be ſelf-condemned if they did not forſake them; but they generally ſeem at moſt but indifferent, if they perceive them at all. Some eaſtern Pagans thus learned perfect moderation toward one another, and hoped that the Deity would accept of all their different modes of religious worſhip, as nature delights in variety.

Some believe abſurdities, becauſe they will believe them without any reaſon; nay, contrary to every reaſon, as tranſubſtantiation; and thus believe with the will, and not with the underſtanding. And it is a fact, that ſpeculative men are as fond of their opinions, or modes of worſhip, as ſenſual ones are of the gratification of their appetites, 1 John ii. 15, 16.; and will not quit them, though they are ſenſible they are wrong, contrary to the fore-mentioned Pagans. Bigots perſuade themſelves, that they are the only favourites of heaven, that God will accept of the religious worſhip and ſervice of none but themſelves, and would not own him as their God that would not condemn all whom they reprobate.

A

COMPREHENSIVE SUMMARY

OF THE

VARIOUS CONTROVERSIES

AMONG

Pagans, Mahometans, Jews, and Chriſtians,

PHILOSOPHICAL AND THEOLOGICAL:

CONTAINING,

A CRITICAL REVIEW OF ALL RELIGIONS.

THE profeſſors of all religions, natural or revealed, agree in the general principles of doctrine, worſhip, and morality.

All nations acknowledged a God, and a future ſtate. Theſe ſeem to be natural principles, or innate ideas, originally impreſſed on the human mind, or at leaſt communicated by univerſal tradition, derived at firſt from revelation. Adepts in oriental and antient literature, as the author of the travels of Cyrus, Stillingfleet, Cudworth, Gale, Hyde, Prideaux, &c. obſerve, that not only the Pagan philoſophers, but alſo the poets and the vulgar, even the Egyptians, the greateſt polytheiſts, and groſſeſt idolaters, as well as the Greeks and Romans, &c. owned but one ſupreme God, though they had many ſubordinate ones; as the animated elements, viz. fire, air, or

wind, earth, water, animals, vegetables, trees, &c. ſtars, demons, heroes, departed ſouls, &c. which they held as mediators and meſſengers of the gods. The poets, with their fictitious fables and allegories, wrapt up every thing in myſtery and obſcurity, as they made riddles of all things: And as the prieſts found the bulk of mankind ſtupid and groſs in their conceptions, and unfit for more pure worſhip, they and the ſtateſmen judged a civil or political religion, a medium betwixt the ſpeculations of the philoſophers and the fancies of the poets, fitteſt for them, as they were unfit for the ſpeculations of the philoſophers. It muſt alſo be obſerved, that their many gods were rather nominations, or titles, attributes, and deſignations of the one God, than different gods; as Juno in the air, Neptune in the ſea, &c. Pallas wiſdom, Mercury ſpeech, &c.*

All nations agreed alſo, that God was to be worſhipped, though they differed in the modes of it. They acknowledged his government, and aſked his protection and direction in all things. Every undertaking, and every refreſhment began with an addreſs to God, and concluded with an acknowledgment to him. They alſo agreed in a future ſtate of ſome kind; as a ſenſual paradiſe, &c. for the virtuous, and various puniſhments for the vitious. And their care of the body after death, which they thought neceſſary to the reſt and happineſs of the deceaſed, had ſome appearance of the notion of a reſurrection.

* See Cudworth's Intellectual Syſtem.

The original mode with the body after death was interment, or to consign it to the earth.

The Grecians prepared a funeral pile, and burnt it, which had the appearance of something savage in it, and they deposited the ashes carefully in an urn; they had also bags of asbestos, composed of a flax that would not burn, or rather of filaments of a certain kind of stone, and the dead body being put into one of these, burnt to ashes, which the bag preserved, as it was not consumed in the fire: and when it was decided who was the best-beloved wife, she cast herself into the funeral pile, together with the body of her husband, or was buried alive with him, that she might have his society in the other world, which was reckoned her special privilege.

The Egyptians extracted the bowels and brains, embalmed and anointed the body with spices, myrrh, and perfumes, (as the Jews also did before burial) to keep it from corruption, and preserve the complection; and covered it with a thin lawn fillet, through which the features appeared. They set it upright; and at first sight one would have thought it alive, till a more strict inspection discovered that the features were motionless. It became so encrusted, or petrified, that it remained entire for many ages: and some of these Egyptian mummies, brought from thence, are yet to be seen in the cabinets of the curious. The kings built the pyramids for palaces to their bodies after death, chusing to have the best habitation where they were to remain longest, even through all ages; but this mode was exposing the meanness of the deceased body.

Some chuſed to be conſigned to the element they worſhipped; to be depoſited in the earth, water, fire, or ſuſpended in the air, according as they worſhipped any of theſe.

Socrates reaſons ſomewhat analogous to Paul, that all things in nature ſpring from their contraries; vegetables decay in autumn, and ariſe from putrefaction in the ſpring; and certain animals, called ſleepers, revive from their torpid or benumbed ſtate; ſo that there is ſomething analogous to the reſurrection of the body, in nature.

The civilized and enlightened Pagans agreed alſo with the profeſſors of all other religions in the principles of morality. Reaſon and conſcience was their rule to diſtinguiſh virtue and vice; called the light of nature, as it diſcovered truth and duty; and the law of nature, as it bound to the practice of it. All nations had alſo oracles, and believed revelation.

The Pagans differed in their notions of the immortality of the ſoul.

The Stoics thought the univerſe conſiſted of a great body, and a great ſoul; and that the ſoul of every particular perſon was a part of the ſoul of the world, and returned to it after death.

The Egyptians, from whom Pythagoras had his knowledge, held the immortality of the ſoul to conſiſt in its tranſmigration from one body or creature to another; and hence the original of calling children by the names of virtuous progenitors, or relations, that the ſoul might tranſmit with the name. Theſe notions of immortality, as alſo the ſenſual paradiſe before-mentioned, are evidently abſurd, and refute themſelves and

one another, as we will ſee afterwards on the Chriſtian ſcheme.

The poets that thought God was the ſoul of the world deified all parts of nature as parts of God, and held every thing ſacred. *Jupiter eſt quodcunque vides*, or, that the world was the temple of God; *Jovis omnia plena, innocui vivite numen adeſt*, and that the ſun, ſtars, and planets, were the manſions of intelligencies, or inferior deities; but theſe notions of God and ſubordinate deities are evidently abſurd, as we will ſee afterwards.

Some of the eaſterns, as the Perſians, &c. whom the Manichean Chriſtians followed, in order to account for the origin of evil, held, that there were two original principles, the one the author of good, and the other the author of evil and matter; and that they were equally powerful; for if the good one were moſt powerful, he would deſtroy all evil, and if the evil one were moſt powerful, he would deſtroy all good; and the laſt-mentioned ſect thought the God of the Jews was the evil one, as he appointed the deſtruction of beaſts by ſacrifice. But this proceeds from a miſtake.

1*ſt*, Becauſe there cannot be two ſelf-exiſtent, or neceſſary-exiſtent independent beings. It is an inconſiſtency; for each being independent, may exiſt alone, and the other may be ſuppoſed not to exiſt; and therefore neither the one nor the other neceſſary-exiſting beings.

2*dly*, Becauſe, if there were two beings equal in power and in oppoſition, they would prevent one another from acting; ſo that they would

produce neither good nor evil, or they would deſtroy one another's operations.

3*dly*, Becauſe no being purſues evil as an end, but only as a mean to gain ſome end, though it is a fooliſh and bad one.

4*thly*, Becauſe there is more good than evil in the condition of every creature, and conſequently in the world; as is evident from this fact, that every creature wiſhes to continue in life and being.

That there was no evil in the original conſtitution of things, is evident from the idea of God, that he muſt be a perfect being; that is, perfectly good, and nothing evil could proceed from his hands. And the tradition of this is preſerved in the poet's account of the golden age, when there were neither calamities nor crimes, and all things were common, like the light of the ſun and the air; and that there was a perpetual ſpring in every clime, before the ſtate of the earth was altered by the inclination of its axis; which turned the waters out of their beds to overflow the earth for crimes committed thereon, and made the inequality of days and ſeaſons in the oblique and parallel ſpheres.

But the origin of evil is accounted for, from the neceſſary imperfection of creatures endued with liberty, or intelligent creatures. God, the father, or author of all things, is the moſt abſolute perfection. And Nothing, the mother of all things, is the moſt abſolute imperfection. But if it be aſked, why did not God make his rational creatures immutable? the anſwer is, That is impoſſible: for that is the property of

Deity alone. Moral evil, or crimes, brought calamities; and moral evil aroſe from the abuſe of liberty, or the power of choice; abuſing that liberty or freedom of will, in making a wrong choice, contrary to the law or rule of conduct received; which was acting contrary to the nature and the reaſon of things. It was impoſſible they could be immutable by nature, and yet be poſſeſſed of liberty, or the dignity of reaſon. Therefore the higheſt rank of creatures, had they been made immutable by nature, muſt have been deſtitute of liberty and choice, and been made to act from neceſſity, and would have had no privilege above the brutes; but immutability is acquired as a habit, from a long ſeries of acts.

The Jewiſh rabbins and philoſophers ſay, that angels, by ceaſing to contemplate the divine excellencies, and through ſelf-conceit or pride, contemplating only their own, thus ſhrunk into themſelves, and fell from their original, by aſpiring ambition, &c.; and man fell by ceaſing to aſpire after heavenly things, and falling in love with ſenſual enjoyments, and earthly things. And the Pagan philoſophers thought, that the ſouls of men in a former ſtate fell into love with earthly things, and for the puniſhment of it were plunged into bodies, to pay the penalty of their former ills, by trials and afflictions in their embodied ſtate, till purged from ſenſual affections.

But revelation, inſtead of having recourſe to a previous conduct in a pre-exiſtent ſtate, to ſolve this difficulty of mankind's being involved

in calamities before they commit crimes, tells us, it was occaſioned by a pre-exiſtent crime of a common progenitor.

They that ſaid, Whether did this man ſin, or his parents, John ix. 2. that he was born blind? were of the Pythagorean perſuaſion, that crimes done in former bodies were puniſhed in ſubſequent ones; and that man's abuſe of his eyes in a former ſtate was puniſhed with the want of them in another. But of this more afterwards. For a more full account of the origin of evil, ſee the ingenious Biſhop King.

Another difference among the Pagans was that which the Antinomian Chriſtians followed, though on principles ſomewhat different.

Many Pagans held, that the gods could do good only, and could inflict no puniſhment; having nothing vindictive in their nature; that there was no ſuch thing as diſpleaſure in them: but this was repreſenting them as doing the greateſt hurt and injuſtice, in ſuffering it to paſs unpuniſhed. Such lenity to the injurer would be cruelty and injuſtice to the injured, and foreign to the idea of a juſt impartial judge, and righteous governor; and moſt unfavourable to the virtuous and pious worſhippers of God. For a more full account of this, ſee that moſt learned and judicious book, entitled, Revelation Examined with Candour.

Moreover, the poets repreſented many of their gods like the baſeſt of men.

Gods partial, changeful, paſſionate, unjuſt; whoſe attributes are rage, revenge, and luſt; and that the way to pleaſe Bacchus, Venus, &c.

was to act like themſelves in their worſhip. And others of them they repreſented as implacable furies, that delighted to ſee them do cruelties to themſelves, and in ſacrificing their relations, which they even did to appeaſe their rage. But it is contrary to the idea of a God, that is of a perfect being, to repreſent him ſo. To deny the purity, or any of the perfections of the divine nature, and the juſtice of the divine government, and that God rules the world by his providence, is worſe than to deny his *very being*. That great man Plutarch ſaid, he would count himſelf leſs injured by one that would deny ever there was ſuch a man, than by another that would own it, and ſay he was a debauched and vicious perſon. Socrates differed from his fellow-citizens, not ſo much in diſowning ſubordinate deities, and inferior worſhip due to them, as the vices aſcribed to them by the poets that debaſed them. And Plato, by excluding the poets from his common-wealth, did thereby exclude their gods, &c.

Beſides theſe differences in their ideas of their gods, and the worſhip ſuitable to them, the Pagans were divided into two grand diviſions with regard to their worſhip, *viz.* the Sabeans, and Magians. The firſt had temples, altars, ſacrifices, images, and other idols. The Magians, whoſe chief reſidence was in Perſia and the Eaſt, and whoſe founder was Zoroaſter, rejected theſe, and ſaid God was like no material thing; and held fire and light to be the beſt ſymbol of him; and thought he was ſatisfied with the ſoul of the ſa-

crifice; and worſhipped toward the ſun-riſing or before the fire. See Prideaux's Connection.

But the origin of idolatry ſeems to be this. Man having loſt the favour of God by offending him, and being excluded from that intimate friendſhip and fellowſhip he at firſt enjoyed with him, and from paradiſe, the place where he enjoyed it; and being naturally poſſeſſed of a deſire of the enjoyment of God, and communion with him, as the only all-ſufficient good that could ſatisfy his vaſt deſires, and his capacity of enjoying the chief good, had recourſe to various ways and means to recover and obtain this object of his boundleſs wiſhes. Senſible of his impurity and imperfection, which renders him incapable of immediate acceſs to God and fellowſhip with him, he imagined that divine virtues reſided in certain creatures, and were communicated through theſe to him, and by the heavenly bodies, and the ſacella, or repreſentations of them when they were below the horizon; and through theſe mediums he thought that divine qualities and virtues were communicated to him. For though the groſs ſtupidity of the vulgar, after being long accuſtomed to theſe, might take them for deities, yet the firſt inventers of them could not do ſo; but, at moſt, ſuppoſed, that the vegetables, animals, *&c.* they held ſacred, were repreſentations of certain qualities in God, or means of conveying them; as the ſerpent of vengeance, the ox of benefits, *&c.* Wretched, falſe mediators, and images of divinity! And the Egyptians themſelves held theſe only as hieroglyphics, emblems and ſymbols; beſides the adoration of the hea-

venly bodies, the elements, vegetables, and animated parts of nature. The firſt invention of idolatry ſeems to have been the deifying anceſtors or progenitors, and erecting images of them. Thus Ninus is ſaid to have been the firſt inventer of idolatry, in deifying his father under the title of Belus, or Lord, after his death. Thus princes, heroes, the inventers of uſeful arts, *&c.* were deified after their death. So that the heathen gods were but dead men, as themſelves confeſs. Their temples were their ſepulchres, *&c.*; and their theogonia, or generation of their gods, intimates thus much; and many of them were the baſeſt of men. Cicero of the nature of the gods acknowledges this. Jupiter, Saturn, Bacchus, Venus, Mercury, were the moſt vicious of men. Mars was a ſoldier, Vulcan a ſmith, Neptune a mariner, Apollo a ſhepherd, Minerva a ſpinſter, Saturn a huſbandman, Eſculapius a phyſician, *&c.*

The Pagans differed alſo about the origin and formation of things, or the world's original; and ſome of them that owned it aſcribed it to other cauſes than the Creator, as chance, *&c.* Though this may ſeem to belong to philoſophy rather than theology, yet it is connected with it, as it relates to the regard due to God as Creator. Some of their opinions and ſchemes of it are unworthy of notice. Though all the ancient nations, as the Egyptians, Chaldeans, Phœnicians, *&c.* and all the primary philoſophers, held by tradition that the world was created, till Ocellus, who lived after the laſt of the prophers, and not long before Plato; yet after ones, to be ſingular,

denied or doubted of it upon this principle, *ex nihilo nihil fit.* But they ſeem to be miſtaken in their ideas here, as if it were alledged that any thing could cauſe, or give being to itſelf. In this ſenſe their hypotheſis is juſt, *ex nihilo nihil fit.* The Academics, Peripatetics, &c. held, that it was made out of pre-exiſtent matter, or that it was eternal, as to both matter and form. Epicurus, or rather Democritus, from whom he had that notion, held, that it came into its preſent ſtate by the caſual concourſe of an infinite number of atoms, that exiſted in the regions of infinite ſpace; but then, as Cicero obſerves, theſe atoms, by their caſual concourſe, have never formed a city or a temple. Spinoza, a late philoſopher, acknowledged no God but the frame of nature; and is ſaid to be the firſt that aſſerted that God ſuffered, viz. when any part of nature ſuffered. Deſcartes ſuppoſed, that if God only created matter, and divided it into a certain number of parts, and put them into motion, it would have produced the world by the mechanical laws of matter and motion, without any more ado. His ſcheme ſeems to be compoſed of pre-exiſtent matter and atoms, a little varied; as, firſt, That all the matter of the univerſe was diviſible into infinite parts, and divided into many, all in motion, and of three elements, or kinds: firſt, The ſun and fixed ſtars; ſecond, The planets, comets, &c.; third, The heavens. Some of his particles were ſpherical, others conical, others triangular, &c. The ſpherical were made ſo by friction; the angles being cut off, became the ſubtile elements, and fill the void parts; and his

triangular ones, wreathed together, make the earth. His particles, being impelled in his vortex, thus formed the ſubtil elements, heavenly bodies, and ſolid matter; but they cannot be ſelf-moving. His ſcheme is but a modification of the atomical. See Stillingfleet's origines ſacræ. Cudworth's intellectual ſyſtem. Clark on the attributes, &c.

(The notions of ſome of the ancients tended to materialize ſpirit, as thoſe of the moderns tended to ſpiritualize matter.) We cannot but remark, that the notions of the ancients, with regard to the motions of the heavenly bodies, were as wild and erroneous as they were with regard to the origin and formation of the univerſe. The Tolemaic ſcheme made all the planets, with the ſun in the midſt of them, revolve in orbits round the earth. This is indeed the apparent motion to a ſuperficial obſerver; and the aſtronomical error of the vulgar, judging according to occular or ſenſible appearance in a ſuperficial manner: For upon a ſtrict obſervation of the apparent ſtationary and retrogade motions, and the different magnitudes of ſome of the planets in their aphelions and apogees, the eye will diſcover that this cannot be the real motion. The Tychonic ſcheme is a medley of the Tolemaic and the true ſyſtem, making all the planets but the earth revolve in orbits about the ſun, but then making him with that ſyſtem revolve about the earth. The notion of the *primum mobile*, or firſt mover, the chryſtalline heavens, the ſeven ſpheres, and firmament of fixed ſtars, were

equally fanciful. See Martin's young gentleman and lady's philoſophy.

Theſe ſchemes of the origin of the world, &c. lead me to conſider an hypotheſis that may perhaps by this time be thought to have been out of my deſign, as I have paſſed it over ſo long, I mean Atheiſm; and indeed it was pretty much out of my deſign, as all ſchemes of it are inconſiſtent and impoſſible. It is a queſtion if there be a ſpeculative Atheiſt in the world; ſuch an unnatural monſtrous production nature cannot produce; but there are too many optional and practical ones, (Pſal. xiv. 1.) that wiſh ſecretly there were no God to puniſh their crimes, and live as if there were no God nor future ſtate of retribution, (Pſal. x. 4.) They conſider not that God will render unto them according to their evil deeds: and many who profeſs to know God act otherwiſe; (Tit. i. 16.) As the author of nature diſplayed obſerves, it is paying too much regard to ſuch as wantonly deny there is a God, to diſpute with them, or offer to convince them, as they deſerve no notice, if it were not to be hiſſed at. They that denied firſt principles, as the being of a God, and the immortality of the ſoul, were hiſſed out of the ſchools as ridiculous and abſurd.

Atheiſts may be reduced to three kinds; firſt, Such as, through ignorance or ſtupidity, are unable or unwilling to think and conſider, and ſo have not attained to the uſe of their faculties; ſecondly, The vicious that have renounced them; thirdly, Thoſe that from partial views, or falſe ideas in logic and philoſophy, think the argu-

ments againſt the being of God more weighty than thoſe that are for it. It is owned on all hands, that the being of a God is to be deſired, and every argument uſed againſt it ſhews this. For if it be ſaid, the notion and belief of a God is not from nature, but policy, then it is owned to be for the good of ſociety. If it be ſuppoſed that the world came into exiſtence by chance, and is every moment ready to be deſtroyed by it, then it is diſmal to live in ſuch a world. If it be ſuppoſed that the world is eternal, and that all things are by fatal neceſſity, then liberty and choice were better. If it be argued from ſuppoſed defects in the frame of nature, and the government of the world by providence, then it is better that the world be made and governed by a perfectly wiſe and good Being. It is ſelf-evident, that ſomething muſt have exiſted from eternity, or been without a beginning, as nothing could be the cauſe of its own exiſtence, for that ſuppoſes it both to exiſt and not to exiſt at the ſame time. And that Being muſt be ſelf-exiſtent, neceſſary-exiſtent, independent, and immutable, elſe it might have ceaſed to be: it muſt alſo be intelligent, omniſcient, immenſe, omnipotent; a free agent, and one; not a ſucceſſion of mutable beings, from no cauſe without, for then there is no internal cauſe of their exiſtence.

The atomical, *&c.* philoſophers, who denied the creation, wanted thereby to exclude the Deity as Creator. And Epicurus, who placed all happineſs in pleaſure of ſenſe and contemplation, denied a providence, or that God took any notice of human affairs, being wholly occupied in

the contemplation of his own excellencies; left only the name of God, and denied the reality, as Cicero obſerves; but he taught to moderate pleaſures, in order to preſerve the reliſh of them, contrary to modern Epecureans. The Sadducees among the Jews were ſimilar to theſe. Deſcartes's ſcheme of the mechanical laws and motions of the particles of matter of certain forms, is but a modification of Epicurus's ſcheme. That the goodneſs of God was communicative from eternity, in creating ſyſtems, and giving being and happineſs to creatures, is reaſonable to ſuppoſe, though it was not ſo neceſſary, but voluntarily. There may be numberleſs ſyſtems of worlds in the immenſity of ſpace.

It is to be remarked, that there is never an error in theology, but it proceeds from one in logic or philoſophy. Men of genius, or ſuch as would be thought ſo, and being but half learned, through the deſire of novelty, ſingularity, curioſity, pride, vanity, &c. would carve out new ways, and deviſe new inventions; and will not follow the good old way with others, but rather go alone in a wrong way. Some aſſerted water to be the firſt principle, and ſo make the gods ſwear by the ocean, or the Stygian lake, as being the firſt thing. Others made air, others made night and chaos, others a ſubtile fiery fluid, pervading all, and diffuſed through all things: and others made hyle the firſt principle, contrary to Moſes, muddy fluid, or mixture of water and earth. Air and light were co-temporary, and were not till the elements were ſeparated. The novelty of arts diſproves

he eternity of the world. Electricity, magnet-
ſm, the mariner's compaſs, &c. &c. are but late
diſcoveries. If matter were ſelf-exiſtent, then it
muſt be neceſſary-exiſting, ſelf-moving, &c.; con-
rary to experience, and have all the properties
of deity. Two original principles are contrary
o the unity of God, as there can be but one
elf-exiſting, neceſſary-exiſting, perfect, indepen-
dent Being. The laws of matter and motion,
s demonſtrated by modern and experimental
hiloſophers, particularly the modern Archime-
des, Newton, ſhew, that it cannot be eternal; for
t is inert in its original ſtate, and continues ei-
her in reſt or motion, till impelled or ſtopped
by external force. It is difficult to find how a-
oms began to move in a vortex where there is
o center of attraction, and to gravitate into
ontinual motion; and more difficult to find how
egetables, animals, and rational beings, with
ctive powers and faculties, paſſions and affec-
ions of the mind, were thus formed; or even
ow the heavens were ſet to revolve in their
ourſes. The notion of ſome philoſophers, that
ll things are generable and corruptible, is con-
rary to the notion of the eternity of the world,
hat nothing is ſo; and that notion, that whate-
er has a beginning has an end; but as there
s no ſign of that yet, therefore there was no
eginning of things, is juſt only concerning what
s diſſoluble, or has the ſeeds and principles of
iſſolution in its nature. And ſome things may
ontinue long ere they be diſſolved, or be re-
ewed periodically, as vegetables in the ſpring.
oncerning which, ſee Ray's wiſdom of God in

the creation; Derham's phyſico-theology and aſtro-theology, and nature diſplayed; the learned author of which juſtly obſerves, that the frame of nature proclaims her Author as clearly as a machine does the ſkill of its maker: And Galen the Pagan phyſician, was convinced of it, from the frame of the human body. Atheiſts, with regard to the origin of things, were divided into ſeveral claſſes; as idealiſts, that aſſerted there is nothing but the idea of a God; and others that aſſerted, ſuch an idea, being incomprehenſible, could not be conceived. But how there can be an idea, ſimple or complex, without an archetype, is inconceivable. The Fataliſts held, that all things are by neceſſity, or that irreſiſtible fate is the ſupreme principle; contrary to experience, and the deſign of all laws. The Hylopathians held, that all things are generable and corruptible, both qualities and forms, from dead matter, and derive all from it. The Coſmoplaſtics held, that a principle of a ſenſeleſs kind preſides over all nature, and animates it with life, or acts it, but with a ſtoical apathy. The Hylozoiac ſtratonics held, that all matter has a living energetic principle, but no intelligence in it. Others held, that a plaſtic virtue, though not a ſenſible one, acted all, but that is Vulcan. Others conſidered the world as a plant or animal, pervaded by a ſubtile fiery fluid, poſſeſſed of intelligence. Others held, that all things ſprung from night and chaos; that they produced an egg, out of which proceeded love, which active principle acts all; and out of chaos begat the heavens and earth, &c.; ſchemes which

with their cosmogonia and theogonia, are too absurd to need refutation. See Burnet's and Whiston's theories; Cudworth's intellectual system of the universe; Stillingfleet's origines sacræ; Clark on the attributes; Fenelon's demonstration of a God; Charnock on the attributes; Bate's existence of a God; More's antidote against Atheism; Bentley's confutation of Atheism; Wilkins on natural and revealed religion; Cicero de legibus et de natura deorum.

Having considered the antient Pagans, we proceed to treat with the modern Deists, who account themselves moral philosophers; that is, such as acknowledge a God, the Creator, Governor, and Judge of the world; the immorality of the soul, or a future state; that God should be worshipped, and the social duties performed, but deny the necessity and reality of revelation; asserting, that reason, or the light of nature, is a sufficient guide to virtue and happiness. The controversy with them may be reduced to three points, viz. the possibility, the necessity, and the evidences of revelation. The first is acknowledged. It is granted, that it is impossible for God to reveal his mind and will to his rational creatures; and that more knowledge can be communicated to man this way, than he can acquire merely by the exercise of his reason, or collect from the works of creation and providence. But, second,

The necessity of it is denied, and the sufficiency of reason, or the light of nature asserted; but the absurdity of this will appear both from facts and authorities. 1. Reason, or the light

of nature, could not diſcover the moſt important things, as a right knowledge of the nature, perfections, and providence of God. A late ingenious, judicious author, has attempted to demonſtrate, that all the knowledge of God that is in the world is from revelation or tradition. Reaſon could not diſcover ſome of the moſt amiable perfections of the divine nature, as, pardoning mercy, redeeming love and grace, &c. though it diſcovered the power, wiſdom, goodneſs, patience, and ſome idea of the juſtice of God in creation and providence. Reaſon could not ſhew what way of worſhip was acceptable to God. Reaſon could not diſcover how forgiveneſs of ſins, and reconciliation to God, or the recovery of his favour, that was loſt by ſin, could be obtained; or, if repentance be a ſufficient atonement, but rather, that it is not; and therefore they offered ſacrifices to atone. Reaſon could obtain no ſatisfying knowledge of the nature of a future ſtate, which is brought to light by revelation, being dark before. Though the heathens might pray, they had no promiſe of being anſwered; and though they ſhould repent, they had no promiſe of pardon.

2. The inſufficiency of nature's light, and the neceſſity of revelation, will appear from the teſtimony and experience of the greateſt men in the Pagan world. We know beſt what reaſon can do, by obſerving what it has done in them who poſſeſſed and exerciſed it, to the higheſt degree attainable by man in the preſent ſtate. The antient philoſophers, as Socrates the father

of Grecian wiſdom, the greateſt man in the Pagan world, with whom it was reckoned a happineſs to live; the divine Plato, &c.; we find greatly at a loſs, groping in the dark, and making heavy complaints of the deficiency of natural light; and ardently wiſhing for ſuperior inſtruction, and expecting, that the goodneſs of heaven would ſend the inſtructor they needed. They could not adviſe the people to perform any worſhip, but ſeemed rather to think, that they ſhould not perſiſt in the religion of their country; but wait till the goodneſs of heaven ſent one with ſufficient ability to teach them, and authority to enforce his precepts and inſtructions. They could not diſcover how evil came into the world, nor how to get rid of it.

They were ſadly perplexed about a future ſtate, and how to obtain the favour of heaven. See Plato's works, in which Socrates' diſcourſes are contained; for he wrote none himſelf, giving this reaſon for it, that the paper was more valuable than any thing he had to write, a reaſon which ſatisfied nobody but himſelf. Before we proceed to conſider the evidences of revelation, we ſhall anſwer an objection, which is the only one of moment that can be made, to the neceſſity of revelation. It is this: If revelation be neceſſary at all, it was neceſſary for all men in all ages; but it has not been granted to all, therefore it is not neceſſary. The anſwer to this is obvious, from the divine conduct in creation and providence; the objection to both being the ſame. For God, in his other diſpenſations, has not given the ſame gifts to all: Some

enjoy liberty, natural, civil, and religious, while others are deſtitute of all theſe. Some are rich, others are poor. Some have a better clime than others. Some ſpecies of creatures poſſeſs a high degree in the order of creation, and others a low, and baſe ſtate.

And its being given gradually, and not all at once, is analagous to the conduct of the Deity in his other diſpenſations. The uſeful arts, and particularly medicine, for the health of the body, were gradually diſcovered. But though the Creator and Governor of the world by his right of ſovereignty, diſtributes his gifts variouſly, as to his infinite wiſdom ſeems meet both in nature and providence, and beſtows ſpecial favours on ſome above others, yet he is ſtill the common parent; and did not totally diſregard the Gentiles, as the Jews imagined, but raiſed up eminent men, almoſt in every age, in the heathen world, to ſtop the torrent of ignorance and corruption. And the heathens were not all ignorant of God, though, by their own fault, moſt of them loſt, not only the promiſe of the goſpel given to the patriarchs, Adam, &c. but alſo the knowledge of God, yet all did not ſo; for though Job and his friends, and Cornelius, were not in the church, but were heathens, yet they worſhipped the true God; and in every nation and age, he that feareth God, and worketh righteouſneſs, is accepted. If they improve the talents they have, no more can be required; and to him that doth ſo, more ſhall be given. They might have the knowledge of the Saviour and his benefits communicated to their minds

by ſupernatural influences and illuminations, without external revelation; as we ſee Job and his friends had. The heathens, by uſing ſacrifices, ſhewed their ſenſe of the need of atonement and a mediator, of which they had a general ſenſe or tradition.

The third thing was the evidences of revelation. Theſe are twofold, direct and indirect, or external and internal. The firſt is alſo twofold; the accompliſhment of prophecies, and the performance of miracles. None can foretel future events with certainty of their accompliſhment; but he that rules the world, directs and diſpoſes of all affairs, and brings to paſs all events; or thoſe to whom he communicates that knowledge. The heathen oracles were mere conjectures and uncertainties, and therefore equivocal, accidental, or falſe; they were generally expreſſed in equivocal terms, as,

Aio te Æacidem Romanos vincere poſſe;

which may be underſtood either ways. I ſay thou, Æacides, may conquer the Romans; or the Romans may conquer thee, Æacides; as alſo, that to Crœſus King of Lydia, when he went over the river Halys, he would overthrow a great empire; which happened to be his own, though he underſtood it otherwiſe. Tho' there be ſome prophecies reſpecting events yet future, not yet accompliſhed, yet many are accompliſhed; as the flood o Noah, predicted 120 years before it happened; the deſtruction of Sodom, Iſrael's going to Egypt, affliction there, deliverance from it, and obtaining poſſeſſion of Canaan.

The time of, and deliverance from the Babyloniſh captivity. Cyrus by name was foretold to be their deliverer about 100 years before he was born. The coming of the Meſſias, and the circumſtances of it, Iſaiah liii. Dan. ix. 24. and he predicted his own death, with the manner of it, and alſo his reſurrection, the propagation of the goſpel, and the oppoſition that would be made to it, &c. Prophecies are frequently expreſſed in figurative terms; if they were literally expreſſed, it would tend to prevent their accompliſhment in ſome caſes. 2dly, Miracles are the ſecond direct, or external evidence of revelation. Revelation itſelf indeed is a miracle, and it was atteſted by miracles. The definition of a miracle is this, it is a violation of the laws of nature; an action or event out of the common courſe of nature; it is an extraordinary ſupernatural event, that could not be effected by any created ſkill or power; as raiſing the dead, &c. for every extraordinary thing is not a miracle. Angels, or inviſible powers, good or bad, may, by ſecrets in nature, perform things above the ſkill or power of man. Moſes, the firſt inſpired writer, atteſted his commiſſion in Egypt at the red ſea, and in the wilderneſs by miracles. And though the magicians of Egypt did like to him in ſome things, either by tricks of legerdemain, and the aid of Satan; ſuddenly removing one object, and ſubſtituting another, ſo that it might be taken for a transformation of one creature into another; or ſuddenly bringing a new object, that it might be taken for a real production; or by darkening or condenſing

the medium, to misrepresent the object; or by a deception of the fancy, which is the case with regard to dreams; yet the magicians owned the finger of God in other things, which they could not do. The other prophets did miracles also, as Elijah, and Elisha in raising the dead. &c.; and particularly Christ and his apostles did many miracles; as healing diseases with a word, stilling the winds and waves, raising the dead, &c. A miracle is the shortest and most direct proof of a divine message or commission. The Jews saying, that Jesus stole the name Jehovah out of the oracle, (which they call Tetragrammaton, as it consists of four letters in the Hebrew,) and that he thereby wrought his miracles, is too fabulous to need confutation: and the subtle sophistry of some late mortal Deists, to destroy the notion of a miracle, is equally absurd, and has been fully answered and refuted by others, as Dr Campbell, &c.; though, like Atheists, they deserved no notice; it being equally contrary to the common sense of mankind, as the denying a material world, and endeavouring to make mankind disbelieve their senses, though the same persons acted by their own; it is of a piece with transubstantiation. The internal or indirect evidences of revelation, are perhaps yet stronger than the external ones. It bears the stamp of divine authority, the seal of heaven, and shews its divine original by the doctrines it contains; which are above the reach of human invention, as the gospel schemes &c. Reason guides one to a full conviction of the external and historical evidences of revelation;

after which it reſigns him to another light, not contrary, but entirely different, and infinitely ſuperior. The internal evidences are many; as, firſt, The antiquity of the ſcriptures, they being the moſt antient hiſtory and writings, in which the art of writing was firſt practiſed; and therefore called Scriptures, by way of eminency; no other hiſtory reaches beyond the flood, but they contain the hiſtory of the creation, and antedeluvian world. Secondly, The majeſty and authority with which they ſpeak, or command and threaten, is truly divine. Thirdly, The excellency of the doctrines and rules of conduct therein contained; calculated for the honour of God, and the good of man, temporal and eternal; to deliver the world from calamities and crimes; enforced with the ſanctions of eternal rewards and puniſhments. See Blackhall's Sufficiency of the Scriptures; Bennet's, and Edwards' Excellency of the Scriptures, above all other writings. Having thus proved the ſcriptures to be a divine revelation, I am not obliged to regard the cavils of adverſaries to any of their contents, as it is plain, that when we are aſſured they are a revelation from God, bearing the divine authority, we are bound to believe the doctrines, and practiſe the duties therein enjoined; and it is folly and blaſphemy to impeach the divine wiſdom, by cavilling at any thing we are aſſured is a revelation from God; like him that ſaid, had he been at the making of the world, it had been better made. Galen, a Pagan phyſician, wondered at the amazing art and ſkill diſplayed in the ſtructure of the hu-

man body. It is plain, we are unable to judge what ſhould be expected in a revelation; and the doctrines of it, like the works of creation and providence, are imperfectly comprehended by us. The goſpel ſcheme is indeed a myſtery, but ſo are the works of nature, and the conduct of providence. But the precepts and duties we are to practiſe are plain to the meaneſt capacity. There are primary principles taken for granted in all ſciences, which mathematicians call data, or a foundation to go upon; without which conceſſions we could not proceed; and religion, both natural and revealed, muſt be ſuppoſed to have ſuch principles. They who denied firſt principles, as the being of a God, and the immortality of the ſoul, were hiſſed out of the ſchools as fooliſh and ridiculous. Poſitive inſtitutions and myſteries are chiefly objected to in ſcripture; but they are bad logicians and philoſophers that cavil at the former.

The Jewiſh rabbins ſaid, that material things are but emblems of things above. And the philoſopher obſerved, that the divine light never deſcends without a covering. While we are clothed with bodies, truth muſt be clothed with a body too, elſe we could not converſe with it; and language itſelf is an emblem. Sounds are the ſigns of ideas or thoughts, and letters are the marks of ſounds; and all languages are full of figures; being too ſcanty to expreſs things in their common acceptation, they are often uſed in another called figurative, conſiſting of tropes, metaphors, allegories, &c. and is impoſſible to avoid that way of expreſſion.

N. B. way is figuratively taken here. Theſe poſitive inſtitutions are chiefly the ſacrifices of the Old Teſtament, and the ſacraments of the New Teſtament. That the firſt were of divine appointment is evident, and by tradition became univerſal, being practiſed by Heathens as well as Jews. It is impoſſible to think any could imagine, that deſtroying the creatures of God would pleaſe him, and atone for crimes, but aggravate them; and it was contrary to their own intereſt: and the archetype to which they referred, and of which they were the natural emblems, (being a natural, not an artificial language) could never have been conceived of, if not revealed. Both their being and uſe were from divine inſtitution. All that ſyſtem was emblematical, and agreeable to the ancient eaſtern manner of inſtruction, as the ſacraments alſo are. Who among the learned is ignorant of the hieroglyphics of Egypt? But the ſacraments may alſo be conſidered as rites, to diſtinguiſh a ſociety from others.

As for myſteries, they are twofold. Firſt, Anything is a myſtery till it be diſcovered. Thus the calling of the Gentiles to become members of the church of God, and partake of the privileges of the goſpel, was, in ſome meaſure, a myſtery to the Jews before the event, as the apoſtle obſerves, Eph. iii.

Secondly, What is not fully comprehended; and thus every thing in nature is a myſtery to man's limited capacity.

An ingenious philoſopher could not underſtand how ſpirit could act on matter, and therefore concluded, that the motion of the finger is

not cauſed by the volition of the mind, but immediately by God Almighty, the primary cauſe of all things. But as he is the pureſt Spirit, therefore he could have leaſt communication with matter. And another could not conceive how heavenly bodies act on fluids, and cauſe the ebbing and flowing of the tides; or what cauſes corpuſcular attraction in ſolid bodies. And indeed it is only the nominal eſſence of things that we know; as that gold is yellow, fuſile, ductile, ſolid, ſoluble in aqua-regia, &c.; but we know not the nature of the particles and ſtamina of which it conſiſts. And there are myſteries in natural religion as well as in the works of creation and providence. We cannot conceive of immenſity without extenſion, or of duration without ſucceſſion; and yet both theſe are foreign to God. A ſmall part cannot comprehend the whole. Ignorance, vanity, and pride, are ſore evils. But revelation was as univerſally acknowledged as the being of a God; for all nations had oracles as well as ſacrifices. So the Deiſts are condemned by the general voice; and Adam at firſt either had revelations, or elſe he had a more perfect wiſdom and knowledge of the nature of things than his lapſed poſterity, as revelation aſſerts, either of which prove the point: For otherwiſe, he could not have known what food was wholeſome, without experience; nor how to give names to the creatures, agreeable to their natures, and deſcriptive of them. Nor could he have had any idea of father and mother, and the ſuperior attachment to a wife. Nor could he have had the power

of ſpeech and language in perfection all at once without revelation, or a ſupernatural endowment different from what is the caſe in after-times That the inſtitution of ſacrifices was by revelation was obſerved before, ſee Dr Owen's reaſon o faith, or the reaſon why we believe the ſcripture to be a divine revelation; Dr Butler's analogy of religion to the conſtitution and courſe of nature, a piece of the moſt excellent logic; and that very learned judicious book, entitled, Revelation examined with candour; and Stackhouſe's connection of profane hiſtory with ſcripture; ſhewing, that there were ſuch perſons and facts as are recorded in ſcripture-hiſtory Shuckford's and Prideaux's connections; Tacitus, &c. In fine, the ſcripture muſt be either from God, or man, or the devil; from the latter they cannot be, as they are contrary to his whole plan, and condemn his whole conduct and if from men, they muſt either be from good men or bad men: they cannot be from the latter, as they condemn their conduct, and therefore they reject them: nor from good men, for ſuch could not commit a forgery; that would be the worſt of conduct, which is ſeverely condemned by them; and therefore they can be aſcribed to no author but God. But the true reaſon that any oppoſe them is given John iii. 19. They want to be under the darker light of nature; it is not for want of ſufficient evidence to an honeſt inquirer that any reject them; for Gilbert Weſt, the moſt able Deiſt, was convinced of Chriſt's reſurrection upon an honeſt inquiry, and wrote the ſtrongeſt proof of it, when

e ſet about writing againſt it. And Lord Lit-leton's letter to him on the converſion of St aul, ſhews that alone to be a ſufficient evidence f Chriſtianity, Paul being the greateſt enemy o it.

The principal oracle of Deiſm is Tindal's hriſtianity as old as the creation; wherein, with ſubtle ſophiſtry of falſe reaſoning, he endea-ours to prove, that religion, like the object of , muſt ſtill be one and the ſame. His primary nd grand deceit lyes in this hypotheſis, as the inge on which all his reaſoning turns. The object deed is ſtill one and the ſame, as he obſerves; ut then it does not follow from thence, as he ould have it, that religion is ſtill one and the me, as the ſubject of it is changed, for that re-uires a change in it. The religion of the end, our duty to God and man, is ſtill one and e ſame; but then the change of man's ſtate quires a change of the religion of the means, new means to obtain that end, to diſpoſe and able him to do his duty; which means, viz. Mediator, and reconciliation to God by him, ith ſupernatural aid, &c. the goſpel ſcheme ntains. But that revelation might be a com-ete ſyſtem, it contains all natural religion, or republication of the law of nature, with new otives and means to perform it, and ſets it in clearer light. Tindal uſes the term light of ture ambiguouſly in three different ſenſes, which uſes promiſcuouſly, and plays upon, in order deceive his reader.

1. For the univerſal ſcheme of fitneſſes, all at can be made known, (or is worthy of God

to diſcover) which implies the recovery of ruine man.

2. For what may be known by the uſe of rea ſon, in attending to nature.

3. For what is actually known.

Shafteſbury, Blunt, Bollingbroke, &c. are o the ſame clan, and a tribe that call themſelv moral philoſophers; as if none were men of learn ing, refinement, and philoſophers, but Deiſts But they only ſhew their vanity and weakne to think themſelves ſuperior to others; for Ad diſon, Steele, Newton, Locke, Boyle, Bacon, &c &c. men far ſuperior to any of them, were Chri ſtians. But they have got that light from reve lation which they pretend to have from reaſon and which the ancient Pagan philoſophers ha not; and thus fight againſt Chriſtianity with i own weapons. Man, as a rational creature, an a free agent, is at liberty with regard to th choice of a religion, as well as with regard to th practice of it; and not under fatal neceſſity as t either, which would deſtroy the diſtinction o virtue and vice, as was obſerved before o liberty and mutability, ſee Connybear, Middl ton, &c. againſt Tindal, Deiſm revealed, an Deiſm delineated; Lelland's view of the Deiſt cal writers; Euſebius's preparatio Evangelic and Lardner's credibility of the goſpel-hiſtory, &

The inſpired writings ſhine with a peculia luſtre and glory, loftineſs and grandeur, maj ſty and ſublimity, beauty and excellency, abov all other writings. They contain hiſtories th moſt venerable for their antiquity; and the dig nity and importance of the ſubjects, as that

e creation of the world, and firſt formation of
l things; the origin of evil, and its progreſs,
l it overwhelmed the world with a flood, &c.
he hiſtory of the patriarchs, and of the church
d people of God, and all the wonders he did
their behalf; and particularly the hiſtory of
e moſt wonderful Perſon ever the world ſaw;
hoſe name, perſon, and every thing pertaining
m, were all wonderful; as his generation, life,
ſts, death, reſurrection, aſcenſion, miſſion of
s apoſtles, and propagation of his goſpel, were
e continued ſcene of wonders. The divine
acles contain doctrines the moſt glorious and
cellent, taught by the prophets, Chriſt, and
s apoſtles; the manifold wiſdom of God in
e goſpel of his Son, whereby peace is made
tween heaven and earth.

The ſacred ſcriptures contain the moſt pure
d excellent precepts, laws, and rules of con-
uct; the true logic and philoſophy, the moſt
orious rewards, and the moſt dreadful puniſh-
ents in their nature and duration, being ex-
eme. They contain the moſt tragical ſcenes,
d amazing wonders; as the fall of man, the
ſtruction of the world by the flood, and of
dom and Gomorrah, &c. by fire and brimſtone
om heaven; the terrible darkneſs, wonders,
d plagues in Egypt; the glorious deliverance
the Iſraelites, by dividing the ſea to make way
r them, and the drowning of the Egyptians;
e pillar of cloud and fire for a guide in the
lderneſs, giving a river of water out of the
ck to follow them, and manna from heaven,
c.; and particularly the miracles of Chriſt and

his apoſtles, and the wonders at his death; when the ſun did faint, the earth did quake, the rocks were rent, when nature ſtood aghaſt, and ſeemed to be diſſolving.

The oracles of heaven contain the moſt ſublime oratory and poetry; all others compared with it is but like a groveling ſhrub beſide the lofty cedar. The book of God contains what all men are keen to pry into, the foreknowledge of future events, &c. It contains alſo comfort to the afflicted, cordials for the languiſhing, and reſtoratives for the fainting ſoul; light to them that are in darkneſs; exceeding great and precious promiſes of all good, even eternal glory and happineſs, and of deliverance from all evil. It excells all human writings, as the ſun excells the moon and ſtars in brightneſs. But who can ſpeak in worthy ſtrains of ſuch a lofty theme!

Let all the Heathen authors join
To form one perfect book,
Great God! when once compar'd with thine,
How mean their writings look!

Having conſidered the Pagan religion, Atheiſm and Deiſm, we proceed to conſider another religion of human device, viz. the Mahometan. It aroſe in the eaſt ſome later than popery in the weſt. The author of it was Mahomet, or Mohammed, a native of Mecca, in that part of Arabia called the Happy. Being poor and illiterate, but deſcended of opulent anceſtors, his ambition fired him with a deſire of advancing his fortune to equal or exceed them. Being engaged in the

mercantile line, he had occaſion to travel thro' ſeveral countries, as Syria, Paleſtine, Egypt, &c. Having obſerved the religious diviſions that took place, their virulent enmity to one another, and their agreement in ſeveral particulars, this opportunity he embraced to form a new ſyſtem of religion on more general principles than any of them, to comprehend all parties. His maſter being dead, he married his widow, and thereby obtained ſome wealth, and an offspring. He was ſeized with an affliction, which he turned to his advantage, viz. epileptic fits; which, he ſaid, were trances into which he was caſt by the divine agency, and in which he had revelations of the divine will, which he was commanded to publiſh to the world. He retired from buſineſs, and betook himſelf to a cloiſter for ſome time, on pretence of devotion, and communion with heaven, to acquire the reputation of ſanctity. He got a dove learned to pick meat out of his ear, and ſaid it was the Holy Ghoſt inſpiring him. He was at firſt derided greatly by his own relations, as well as others; but he bore all with invincible patience and perſeverance in the proſecution of his deſign. He could not have carried on his plan for want of education, had he not been aſſiſted by an apoſtate Jew, and a Chriſtian monk, that had left his cloiſter, who wrote his pretended revelations, which are contained in the koran, or alcoran, the book, being ſo called by way of eminency. Roſs, in his caveat for reading it, obſerves, that it has been much altered after his death, and has neither language nor order. It is divided into 124 chapters, con-

ſiſting of fables, lies, blaſphemies, &c. It conſiſts of ſuch wares as muſt not be ſeen, but wrapt up in bundles, for it is criminal to tranſlate, or give it to a ſtranger. It is a medley of ſuch horrid ſtuff, as plainly ſhews he was in an enthuſiaſtic, delirium, (which Dr Caſaubon, on enthuſiaſm, ſays he got in a fever before he ſet up for a prophet) he pretends he got it by means of the angel Gabriel. It is now to be found in the Latin, Engliſh, French, &c. languages. Though ignorant, rude, and enthuſiaſtic, yet his mind was enlarged by travelling, which made him calculate his religion to be univerſal; being a medley of the Pagan, Jewiſh, and Chriſtian, in order to comprehend them all. It was a maxim with him, that if people live a good life, they may be ſaved in any religion; which is ſimilar to a notion of ſome Pagans, that every one's religion is true, becauſe every one takes that for God which he worſhips.

It is certain, no perſon can be ſaved in the profeſſion of the beſt religion, if his life be bad, or if he does not believe his own principles to be true. What he had of the Chriſtian religion was from the Arian hereſy, which then raged in the eaſt; it acknowledged Chriſt's prophetical office, &c. but denied his divinity. The inhabitants of Arabia, and other countries thereabouts, were Pagans mixt with Jews, who were ſcattered every where by perſecution. His future ſtate is from the Pagans, viz. their Elyſian Fields, or ſenſual Paradiſe, for the virtuous; in which are ſhady groves, purling ſtreams, murmuring rivulets, delicious fruits, beautiful wo-

men with black eyes, and eye-brows as wide as the rain-bow, &c. And theſe who died in his wars, in the propagation and defence of his religion, were to have pleaſures more intenſe than others; but thoſe who rejected his religion, were condemned to drink rivers of burning pitch, and ſuffer puniſhments ſimilar to the Pagan's pyriphlegethon, and dark regions, &c. The good and bad actions being weighed in ſcales, if they are equal in weight, the authors of this equality of virtues and vices go to a middle place called Araf, where there is neither pleaſure nor pain, happineſs nor miſery. He owned, that Moſes and Chriſt were greater than any of the other prophets, that each of them were ſent of God, to propagate religion; the one by threatnings and terror, the other by encouragements; but both proving ineffectual, he was ſent with a larger commiſſion than any of them, to propagate religion by the ſword. Not only to publiſh it, and uſe perſuaſion, but to compel them to embrace it by force of arms, and to ſubdue and deſtroy thoſe that would not ſubmit to his religion; and to eſtabliſh a dominion or kingdom on earth, that ſhould propagate and ſupport the divine law through the world; that ſuch as did not ſubmit to it were doomed to utter ruin. Having obſerved that drinking indiſpoſed for his ſervice, he forbade his followers the uſe of wine and ſtrong drink, and alſo blood and ſwine's fleſh: he allowed polygamy, and had many wives himſelf, being greatly addicted to venery; and when any of his votaries objected to any piece of his conduct,

there came out ſtill another chapter of the koran, granting the Prophet great liberties. He taught predeſtination, or the doctrine of fate, to encourage his followers in his wars. When he had got a number of diſciples, he armed them, and proceeded to ſubject theſe wild tribes to his religion and government. A plot being formed againſt him at Mecca, he fled to Medina, 270 miles diſtant; from this flight, called Hegira, being in the 622d year of Chriſt, the 44th year of his age, and the 4th of his miniſtry, they computed their time; and Friday being the day in which he made his eſcape, and began the ſucceſs and proſperity of his empire, they keep it as their Sabbath. They keep Lent, and eat nothing from ſun-riſing to ſun-ſetting during the whole month Ramadan. By art and arms he made many proſyletes, from Pagans, Jews, and Arians. The deluſion ſpread over Arabia, Syria, Egypt, Perſia, &c. When ſome of his muſſulmen, or believers, put him hard to it, to confirm his miſſion by miracles, he at firſt declined miracles, as a teſt or motive to receive his religion, but afterwards he pretended ſome. He was bred a Pagan idolater, and lived a very wicked life before he deviſed the ſcheme of a new religion, as the moſt likely way to raiſe himſelf. When he ſet up for an apoſtle of God, and a prophet, he oppoſed and overthrew the Pagan idolatry and their temples. There was a famous one at Mecca, like to Delphos among the Greeks, which was the kebla towards which they ſet their faces when they worſhipped, as the Jews did towards Jeruſalem; he alſo made Mecca the

kebla for his muſſulmen. He pretended to revive the religion of Adam and Abraham, and reform the Old and New Teſtaments from the corruptions made in them, whereby he might prove his miſſion from them, as from Deut. xxxiii. 2. He ſaid the law came to Moſes on Sinai, the goſpel to Jeſus at Jeruſalem, and the koran to him at Mecca; and he ſaid he was the comforter mentioned John xvi. 7. He ſaid the original of the alcoran was in heaven, from whence Gabriel brought him it, chapter by chapter, which were laid up in the cheſt of his apoſtleſhip, out of which the alcoran was compiled after his death; but as ſome papers were then not legible, part of it was taken from tradition, or the memories of thoſe that had heard it. They have alſo a volume of traditions called Sonnah, which indeed contain all their theology and religion, ſpeculative and practical, which is the unity of God and moral duties. The Pagan idolaters and the civil government, oppoſed him as encroaching on them; but he allured ſome by proſpect of rewards, and frightened others by fear of puniſhments, to embrace his religion. He told them what had befel the world, and Sodom, and Egypt, for diſobeying Noah, and Lot, and Moſes, the prophets of God. He told them, that Moſes and Chriſt were ſent to propagate religion by miracles; but he was ſent to do it with the ſword; accordingly, their doctors have a ſword beſide them when they harangue. His journey to heaven was his greateſt prodigy. In the 12th year of his miſſion, the angel Gabriel rapped at his door one night when

he was in his bed; he had 70 pair of wings, and the beaſt Alborak with him, on which the prophets uſed to ride; it was white, and partly horſe, aſs, and mule, or a middle between the two laſt, and went as faſt as lightning, which the name ſignifies. When he was brought to Jeruſalem by the angel, all the prophets met him, and owned his ſuperiority. He had only one ſpeck of corruption on his heart, a vulture made a hole in his breaſt with its bill, and picked it out. He aſcended to heaven with the angel on a ladder of divine light, and left the beaſt at Jeruſalem till he deſcended again. He went through ſeven heavens before he came to the throne of God, which was in the laſt one, and Gabriel left him at the entrance of it, and waited till he returned from converſing with God, who gave him the offer to be next himſelf; but he rather choſe to deſcend again to the earth, to propagate his religion. His heavens were all 500 years journey diſtant from one another. He met ſome one of the patriarchs in each of them. One was of ſilver, another of gold, another of emerald, &c. and the laſt of light. He ſaw angels in the likeneſs of all creatures in them. He ſaw a great bull bearing the earth on his horns, and when he ſhaked his head there was an earthquake. There was alſo a cock, who ſtood on one, and his head reached another; his voice was heard through heaven and earth, and ſet all the cocks on earth a crowing. He ſaw an angel of 70,000 days journey between his eyes, the proportion of a man to the diſtance between his eyes is as 72 to one; ſo that his ſtature muſt then have been

4,000 years journey, four times the height of ll his heavens, in which he was quite out of his nathematics. In the ſeventh heaven, where God nd Chriſt were, was an angel with 70,000 heads; nd in each head 70,000 tongues, with which e praiſed God. Gabriel accompanied him down rom heaven to Jeruſalem, and from thence con-eyed him, with the beaſt Alborak, to Mecca; nd all this was done in the tenth part of a ight, (a dream, or delirium.) He choſe 12 poſtles, and he made it death to diſpute about is religion, and ordered to fight for it with the word. Infidels are allowed to live among them pon paying an yearly tribute as a fine for their nfidelity. He pretended the temple of Mecca as built in paradiſe, and taken from thence up heaven, and came down to Mecca. He turn-d prince as well as prophet, and with his party obbed and plundered merchant-companies on the ay, and all that would not ſubmit. And his ucceſſors continue to be prince and prieſt both, nder the name of Caliph. He pretended he left the moon in two.

He pretended another miracle, viz. that a houlder of mutton ſpoke to him, and told him was poiſoned; which had been done by one o try if he was a prophet, and would know it; eeing one of his companions ſickened by eat-ng of it, and which proved fatal to him, he left ff eating, but never got the better of the poi-on, it being the cauſe of his death three years fter, when 63 years old. He had a number of ives, one of whom he married at ſix years old, nd cohabited with her at eight, the uſual time

they are mature for marriage in that country. He prohibited his beſt-beloved wife Ayeſha to marry after his death, as ſhe was the prophet's favourite wife, though young when he died, which was a great affliction in that ſultry region. He was not put into a lead coffin, and ſuſpended between two magnets, as is fabulouſly reported, that he ordered to try if he would hang ſo as a proof of his miſſion; for he was buried under the bed in which he died in his chamber at Medina.

His followers believe in one God, and Mahomet, his prophet, their mediator, by whom they make their addreſſes. He is to them what Moſes was to the Jews before his death. He ſpoke honourably of Moſes and Chriſt, but denied the Trinity, and Chriſt's divinity, that himſelf might be a greater prophet than Chriſt.

The Mahometan places of worſhip are called Moſques, and their doctors Muftis. They are ſo ſtrictly honeſt, that if one loſe any thing on the way, it will lye till the owner return to get it; none that finds it will take it up, and if the owner do not find it when he returns, he will ſay a Chriſtian has been here. When they take their goods to the market, they mark the price on them, leave them, and return to their buſineſs or houſes; and whoever wants to purchaſe any thing, takes what he needs, and leaves the price beſide it, and when the owner returns at night he gets the money, and the remainder of his goods. Thus we ſee how ſtrict they are in their morals. All men and all religions are judged or valued by their morals, as it is their

norals that make them good or bad members f ſociety; and they who are not good mem-ers of ſociety in this world, are not likely to e fit candidates for a better; thoſe who are ot pious, ſober, temperate, and juſt, cannot ave the approbation of either God or man.

Mahomet's law contains the following pre-epts:

1*ſt*, That there is one God, and one prophet o be acknowledged.

2*dly*, That parents and ſuperiors are to be re-pected.

3*dly*, That brotherly-love is to be practiſed.

4*thly*, That proper times for devotion are to e obſerved, viz. three daily at leaſt are to be bſerved.

5*thly*, That a yearly Lent is to be kept.

6*thly*, That alms are to be given to the needy.

7*thly*, That matrimony is to be obſerved at 5 years of age.

8*thly*, Murder is forbidden, and alſo adultery, lood, falſe-witneſs; good works are to be main-ined, Friday's devotion, and pilgrimages to lecca at leaſt once in their life are to be done, s neceſſary to ſalvation; and to viſit the pro-het's ſepulchre, and the hill of pardon, where ey leave their ſins, *&c.*; and to avoid covet-uſneſs, uſury, oppreſſion, lying, diſputation a-out the alcoran and religion: They are forbid wearing, drinking, playing at games, *&c.*

They have their ſaints relics, miracles, *&c.* perſtitions; but what increaſed them ſo much, , that they are more ſober, temperate, juſt, nd honeſt, than Chriſtians in general. And

they allow no diſputes about religion, and yet they are divided into two great ſects, that of Hali and that of Omer. The Turks and Arabians differ in many notions from the ſect of Hali and the Perſians; the one makes God the author of both good and evil, the other of good only. They have eight orders of prieſts, of whom the Mufti is the chief. The derviſes are mendicants. Though they do not extirpate, yet they ſadly oppreſs the remains of the eaſtern churches under their government. Mahometaniſm has been a rod on the church of God longer than any other. Egypt oppreſſed it 200 years, the Canaanites 20, Moab 18, the Philiſtines 40, Aſſyria and Chaldea, from firſt to laſt 300, Epiphanes 40, Rome, from Nero to Conſtantine, 260, the Goths and Lombards 300, but Mahometaniſm has continued above 1000. Mahomet began an empire which ſoon ſubjected a great part of the world: It over-ran a great part of Europe, as well as of Aſia and Africa, and conquered more in 80 than the Romans did in 800 years. Like Chriſtians, they make none ſlaves that profeſs their religion. They formerly oppreſſed, but did not extirpate Jews and Chriſtians; but now they have granted a toleration to thoſe of other religions. There are three empires of the Mahometan religion at this day, that of the Grand Signior in Europe and Aſia, the ſeat of the Greek church and empire formerly; that of Perſia, and that of the Mogul empire. (There are alſo three Pagan, that of the Nabobs in India, Japan, and the great empire of China, great idolaters. As for the We

ndians, they are not formed into civil ſociety, y having laws and government eſtabliſhed; hey, and the Negroes, and Hottentots, *&c.* herit not our attention.)

The profeſſors of the Mahometan religion are alled Turks, Saracens, Tartars, Moors, *&c.* rom their reſpective countries. See Knolle's nd Jones' hiſtories of the Turks; Gagnier's, De Ryer's, and Prideaux's life of Mahomet. He ied in the ſixty-third year of his age, having id the foundation of an empire, perhaps great- r in extent and power, as well as duration, than ny that ever was formed.

N. B. The alcoran needs only to be ſeen to efute itſelf.

Having conſidered and diſmiſſed theſe religions hat are of human device and authority, we pro- eed to conſider thoſe that are of divine original nd authority. The firſt of theſe is the Jewiſh. has been partly conſidered on the Deiſtical ontroverſy as being a part of revelation. What e are now chiefly to conſider is, wherein it dif- ers from the Chriſtian religion, and to ſhew hat it is ſuperſeded by it; and conſider the mi- akes of the Jews concerning it, and wherein he different parties among them erred. But e ſhall previouſly conſider the period of the hurch of God, antecedent to what may be call- d Moſaic and Jewiſh, and ſhall begin with con- dering the primitive ſtate of it.

The church of God was one in all ages ſince he ſecond covenant took place, (and may be alled Chriſtian, as it was founded on the pro-

miſe of Chriſt the Mediator) though under different diſpenſations; that of the Old Teſtament, or firſt diſpenſation of the covenant, and that of the New Teſtament, or ſecond diſpenſation of it. The firſt diſpenſation was partly moral and partly poſitive, which divines diſtinguiſh into moral, natural and moral poſitive; the ſecond has, ſtrictly ſpeaking, but two poſitive inſtitutions. The diſpenſation of the law of nature given to man in his primitive ſtate in the form of a covenant was wholly moral, as conſiſting only of the religion of the end, in the capacity and enjoyment of which man was created. Yet as man conſiſted of matter and ſpirit, ſome material ordinances of religion were given him; or external ſymbols and emblems, which are alſo called ſacraments, viz. the trees of knowledge and of life; ſignifying, that, if he perſormed both the poſitive precept and the moral law, or the whole will of God, he would never know evil, but live for ever, or enjoy the favour of God and life in it, (*N. B.* by life is meant happineſs;) but if he failed, he would experimentally know he had loſt the good he enjoyed, and would ſuffer evil and death, or miſery. He might have ſinned tho' he had not eaten the forbidden fruit, though he could not have ſo immediately failed of the love of either God or man in breaking either of the tables of the law. As he had newly received his being from God, was placed in ſo excellent and happy a ſtate, which tended to inſpire him with parental love and gratitude, he had no temptation or means to profane his name or Sabbath, deſert or corrupt his worſhip and

ſervice; he had no earthly parents to offend, none to murder, commit adultery with, ſteal from, or lie againſt, but the wife of his boſom, who was a part of himſelf, his only companion, and joint-poſſeſſor of the dominion of the earth. He was made lord of all but one tree, which was reſerved as a memorial to him of his dependence, and that he held all of his ſovereign Landlord; to make him keep in mind the ſource of his happineſs, and not forſake it. It was an uſeful memorial to him, and not an invidious reſtriction, as the tempter repreſented it, and which his avarice and ambition graſped at.

Man would be angels, angels would be gods; and notwithſtanding his ingratitude, diſobedience, rebellion, diſcontent, pride, curioſity, &c. the goodneſs of God regarded him, and graciouſly vouchſafed to recover him from his ruined ſtate; as he ſinned by ſeduction, and as the whole race would have periſhed in him. Satan and his accomplices ſinned without ſeduction, and ſeduced man alſo, and thereby excluded themſelves from all hope and favour: but the beam of hope to man diſpelled the dreadful gloom of horror, guilt, and deſpair; it ſhone glorioufly in the promiſe of the Meſſiah and his ſalvation, Gen. iii. 15. Rom. vi. 20. 1 John iii. 8.; which introduced a new diſpenſation, by a Mediator betwixt parties at variance, to reconcile them, by redreſſing the injury done. This diſpenſation was partly moral, but attended with new motives, principles, and privileges, and partly evangelical; which then conſiſted in poſitive inſtitutions, or ſymbols, ceremonies, types, figures,

and emblems of the archetype to which they referred, even the great propitiatory Sacrifice to be offered, and atonement to be made by the great Purifier and Sanctifier. The donation of firſt-fruits might perhaps indeed have been preſented in the ſtate of nature and innocency, as a teſtimony of gratitude, dependence, and ſubjection.

The poſitive inſtitutions in the patriarchal period conſiſted chiefly of a holocauſt and a libation. The only bloody ſacrifice ſeems to have been the holocauſt, or whole burnt-offering, beſides the rites in ratifying covenants, of dividing an animal, and paſſing between the pieces, which rather ſignified an imprecation of a ſimilar fate to the breakers of it. In the death of the ſacrifice man ſaw the demerit of ſin; he had alſo a repreſentation of what he was to undergo: So that theſe ordinances had alſo an inſtructive, rational, and moral meaning, as well as a typical one.

The waſhings, luſtrations, and purifications of the Jewiſh ſyſtem, as well as their abſtaining from things unclean, had a moral meaning; and repreſented the need of purity of diſpoſitions and life, and that they ought to abſtain from ſin, which is moral pollution; though the purifications had alſo a typical meaning, and repreſented the fountain that only can cleanſe from ſin, Zech. xiii. 1. 1 John v. 8. Rev. i. 5.

The holocauſt being wholly conſumed, denoted the wrath and curſe due to conſume the offender that offered it. It aſcended wholly up in ſmoke, as it were with its perfume, to remove

the ill ſavour of moral filthineſs. The parts of prayer were alſo repreſented by the offering of the ſacrifice; as confeſſion of ſin, petition of forgiveneſs, and gratitude or thank giving, called the calves of the lips, being ſymbolic prayers. But that was not all, nor the principal uſe and deſign of them, as ſome fondly imagine, for it was atonement by the ſhedding of blood.

The Moſaic or Levitical, afterwards called the Jewiſh diſpenſation, as the ordinances and church, were preſerved in the tribe of Judah after the ſeparation and extinction of the ten tribes, and was a ſyſtem of many additional ordinances: To the burnt-offering, or general expiation, were added particular expiatory ones, as the ſin offering, 2 Cor. v. 21. For ſins of ignorance and omiſſion, the treſpaſs-offering; for theſe of ſurpriſe, or ſuch as were occaſioned thro' fear, &c. the peace-offering, Eph. ii. 14. of which the offerer did partake as a mark of God's being reconciled and at peace with him. It was euchariſtical and ſupplicatory, and alſo piacular. Feaſting together denotes friendſhip. The part offered was God's part.

Theſe were bloody ſacrifices, conſiſting of clean beaſts and birds, emblems of purity; and chiefly lambs and doves, emblems of innocence. The heave, wave, and meat-offerings, &c. were acknowledgments of dependence. The libation, or drink-offering poured out, had a propitiatory meaning, as the pouring out of the blood of the ſacrifice had; the ſprinkling denoted purification. The meat-offering was a donation, as was before obſerved; the heave and wave-offerings being

elevated towards the four quarters of the world, was an acknowledgment, that God was the univerſal Lord. Wine, oil, ſalt, and the prohibition of leaven, had all their emblematical or moral meaning; as atonement, illumination, ſincerity without corrupt ends; which was denoted by leaven, as being oppoſite to ſalt. Waſhing denoted moral pollution, and the need and means of purification. Beſides theſe holy things, there were holy perſons, places, and times; as the firſt-born, and the Levites, afterwards put in their place. For, beſides the additional propriety God claimed to the Sabbath, and the firſt-born, on account of their deliverance from Egypt, both were devoted before; for the firſt born was by birth-right, prieſt, and prince of the family and tribe. The prieſts and prieſthood were emblems of our great High Prieſt and his prieſtly office; and particularly the high prieſt, with his golden and linen garments, which were emblems of his divinity, and the ſpotleſs purity of his humanity. The mitre, or crown on the high prieſt's head, was an emblem of Chriſt's regal office; the long white robe, of the purity and perfection of his prieſthood; the ſcarlet and crimſon ones, of his atonement; the urim and thumim, which ſignify light and perfection, denoted that of his prophetic office; the breaſt-plate, with the precious ſtones, and the names of the tribes in them, and the ephod with the ſame; and theſe, being joined together, denoted his paſtoral care and government, with love and affection bearing the burden of their affairs, Iſaiah ix. 6.; the bells and pomegranates, hung at the robe

of the ephod, denoted the joyful ſound and rich proviſions of the goſpel, as did alſo the table of ſhew-bread. The preſenting the blood, and offering incenſe, in the holy and moſt holy place, denoted his oblation and interceſſion. The holy places were the holy land and holy city, the habitations of a people holy to the Lord; the cities of refuge alſo, which repreſented Chriſt. The tabernacle, the ark and the temple, where the cloud of glory or preſence of God abode, were holy things, that conſecrated the places where they were; the tabernacle was a moveable tent, the emblem of Chriſt's human nature, John i. 14. the original ſignifies tabernacled among us. The feaſt of tabernacled, and their dwelling eight days in tents or booths at that time, ſhewed they profeſſed themſelves to be pilgrims and ſtrangers on earth. The temple was a houſe furniſhed as a habitation for God, where the ſymbol of his preſence dwelt. The meaning of a temple is the habitation of a God, Pſal. cxxxii. 6.; Chriſt's body and believers are ſo called, as the divine nature and Holy Spirit reſides in them. The Jewiſh temple was the grandeſt ſtructure in the world: it was overlaid and paved with gold; and the outſide, being white marble, had a prodigious luſtre. The outer court repreſented the viſible, the holy place the inviſible, and the moſt holy the church-triumphant. In it were the ark, the mercy ſeat, the two tables of the law covered with it, the golden pot with manna, the cherubims, and the altar of incenſe, &c. The ſacrifices were beaſts of the field or fowls, which were to be

tame, clean, and perfect; living creatures were properly called ſacrifices; and the vegetables, as firſt fruits, corn, wine, oil, &c. were properly called offerings. The Jewiſh ordinances were a natural and viſible language, addreſſed to the ſenſes; (the ceremonial external purifications could only purify from ceremonial pollution;) the eaſterns were accuſtomed to this language, and reliſhed no other; and the Old Teſtament-ſaints ſaw the atonement and purification by Chriſt in theſe as in a glaſs. The apoſtle therefore ſays they had the goſpel preached to them. Heb. iv. 2. As the ſacrifices were to be offered only at the temple and altar, ſo the ſervices of ſaints are accepted only in Chriſt. His divine nature was the altar, his human nature the ſacrifice, and he himſelf the prieſt. The candleſticks repreſented the church, the oil the influences of his Spirit. The pearls and precious ſtones, that ſparkled like ſtars, and adorned the wall of the temple, repreſented the graces of his Spirit. The mercy-ſeat repreſented Chriſt; its covering, the tables, repreſented his fulfilling the law, and removing the curſe. Aaron's rod that budded denoted the increaſe of the church; Heb. ix. The curtains and vails of the tabernacle and temple denoted the diſtinction between the viſible and inviſible church; and that between the church-militant and triumphant, and alſo Chriſt's human nature vailing his divinity. The inviſible church, and the world to come, as well as the divinity, are vailed to mortal eyes. As ſinners pollute all things they approach, the tabernacle, altar, and other things, were to be

purified and atoned. They alſo polluted their land and habitations, as the Heathens did with their idolatry. The rites forbidden the Jews were magically uſed by the Heathens; as ſowing their fields with divers ſeeds, uſing cloathes mixt of linen and wool, rounding the corners of their heads and beards, making cattle gender with divers kinds, drinking blood of the ſacrifice, obſerving lucky times. The holy times were the Sabbaths. The new moons, denoting the renovation of the church. The ſeventh year, or year of reſt from labour, in which the land reſted from huſbandry, was devoted to religion, as reading the law, &c. The ſeven times ſeventh year, or jubilee, ſo called from jobel, a ram's horn, as they intimated it with the ſounding of cornets; or from jabal, to bring back, becauſe then mortgaged eſtates were reſtored to their original owners, and liberty recovered, and all things ſet to rights; which occaſioned great joy, as the Roman word jubilee ſignifies. It was an emblem of the reſtoration of man to ſpiritual liberty, by his releaſe from the ſervitude of ſin, &c. and the recovery of his loſt happineſs by the Meſſiah. See Ainſworth on the Pentateuch, Willet on Leviticus, Mather on the Types, or M'Ewen's abridgement of it; and Lowman's rational of the Hebrew Ritual. Theſe were the principal things; others there were, as the braſen ſerpent, the water from the rock that followed them as a river, and the manna from heaven, emblems of the healing, purifying virtue of Chriſt, the bread and water of life. The Nazarites were emblems of Chriſt's purity, who

was not a legal, *i. e.* ceremonial, but real Nazarite, John iii. 14, 15. 1 Cor. x. 4. Lam. vi. 7. Numb. vi. Judges xiii. 5. 1 Sam. i. 11.

Now as these were shadows, or representations, they had no further signification after that which they represented was exhibited; but were thereby abolished, or rendered null and void. See the Epistle to the Hebrews, which is the harmony of the Old and New Testaments; and the incomparable Dr Owen on it, compared with the latter part of Exodus, and the whole of Leviticus. As the Jewish dispensation had no virtue in itself, but only represented Christ and his death, &c. so when he finished his active and passive obedience, he fulfilled these predictions, and accomplished these types. Believers under the Old Testament saw his atonement through these as through a glass. Had he not suffered, they could have had no meaning; as they were thereby superseded.

We proceed to consider the conduct of the Jews in latter times. The Jews had a violent propensity to idolatry, notwithstanding that God's prophets, and oracles, and ordinances, and the symbol of his presence, were among them; till the Babylonish furnace thoroughly purged them of that corruption; and ever since, to this day, there is no evil befalls them, but they say, There's a part of the punishment of the golden calf, their first idolatry, in it. And one of their rabbins says, the four national transgressions mentioned Amos ii. 4. were, first, their selling Joseph into Egypt, for which they were afterwards in bondage there 200 years; the second was, their

making and worſhipping the golden calf, for which they were made to wander 40 years in the wilderneſs; the third was, their killing the prophets, for which they were carried to Babylon, and kept in captivity there 70 years: the fourth was, their rejecting and killing the Meſſiah, for which their civil and eccleſiaſtical ſtate were totally deſtroyed, and they were ſcattered through all the earth. After the Babyloniſh captivity, they turned from idolatry to ſuperſtition, formality, hypocriſy, and ſchiſm, &c.

They were divided into ſeveral ſects, of which the Phariſees, which ſignify Separatiſts, or Seceders, were the chief, and made the greateſt figure. They made the greateſt ſhew of religion, but were groſs hypocrites, and very ſuperſtitious, as the Prince of teachers ſhews: they faſted twice a week or oftner; yea, and for ſevere penance, like the Papiſts of the ninth and tenth century, lay with their naked bodies on the ground, ſpread ſackcloth above them, and pebbles, briers, and thorns below them, for more ſevere mortification; and, at the ſame time, harboured pride, malice, and covetouſneſs, &c. the more, and neglected moral duties, as the true mortification, ſelf-denial, repentance, and the practice of the love of God and man; and bought their ceremonial ſervices, and typical atonements, real ones; and thus miſtook the true meaning of the law. They bred tumults, ſeditions, and uproars in the ſtate; they added traditions to the law, and, like the Papiſts, laid more weight on them than the written word. They ſaid Moſes received and wrote the writ-

ten law in the day time on the mount, and received the traditions in the night time; which he delivered to the elders, and they to the prophets; and at laſt they were written in the book, called Miſneh, or a ſecond law.

The Sadducees were ſo called from Tſadok their teacher, a good man, who taught his diſciples, that they ſhould not ſerve God from the hope of reward, or fear of puniſhment, as being mercenary or ſervile motives; but that they ſhould ſerve him from diſintereſted love, on account of his own excellency; from whence they took occaſion to think there were no future rewards or puniſhments, nor a future ſtate. They denied the reſurrection, and the exiſtence of angels and ſpirits; but they held it neceſſary to be virtuous, in order to enjoy the favour of God and proſperity in this life. They were generally the people of higher rank, who could afford the luxuries of life, and much like the Pagan Epicureans. They aſſerted free-will, rejected traditions, and acknowledged no ſcriptures but the Pentateuch; and therefore Chriſt proves the reſurrection from it, Matth. xxii. 32.; and ſhewed they knew not the ſcriptures, the truth, nor the power of God, that could raiſe the dead, and to which nothing is impoſſible; nor the nature of a future ſtate, where there are no ſuch relations as in this ſtate.

To be a God to any is to be the ſource of good to them; and this ſuppoſes their exiſtence, that they may be capable to receive and enjoy it, and that fully and completely in their whole perſons; for if he was the God of Abraham and the other

patriarchs, he was the God of their whole perſons, conſiſting of ſoul and body; and therefore though their bodies were then dead or aſleep in the grave, they would awake, and ariſe again to enjoy glory and happineſs in the fountain of all good.

We find ſome of the Phariſees converted to Chriſtianity, and miracles performed for that purpoſe, as to Paul, &c.; but we find nothing ſuch granted to the Sadducees, nor any inſtances of their converſion. As they oppoſed the very firſt notices of nature's light, they deſerved no miraculous means. And they were always violent oppreſſors of Chriſtianity, becauſe it aſſerts the reſurrection. They were juſtly rejected for acting contrary to the very light of nature, in denying the exiſtence of the ſoul in a ſeparate and future ſtate.

Another ſect mentioned in the New Teſtament is the Herodians, who ſeem to have been conformiſts to the times and the humour of the prince, and would change their religion with a change of government; as the common proverb ſays, Whoever would be king, they would be ſubject. Similar to the opinion of ſome, who think every one ſhould be of the religion of the country where he reſides; or continue to be of his native religion, if he leave not his native country. But this notion, if applied to the liberal and mechanical arts, would have prevented all improvement, and kept mankind in perpetual ignorance and barbarity; and, if applied to religion, would have kept the Heathens in perpetual

idolatry and corruption, and would have prevented the very being of the Chriſtian religion.

The Karaites, among the Jews, rejected traditions, and kept to the letter of the text. The ſcribes and lawyers were of two kinds, ſuch as did buſineſs in civil matters, and ſuch as wrote copies of the ſcriptures, with critical notes and expoſitions; and decided queſtions of the moral law in courts of judicature, many of which were condemned by Chriſt as corrupt.

The Eſſenes are not mentioned in ſcripture, but in Jewiſh authors: they were a kind of quietiſts, and chuſed retirement, and the country life, apart from public places and employments, as merchandiſe, &c. They were perhaps the beſt ſect among the Jews, as they were ſober and temperate. They abſtained from wine and oaths, and had a community of goods. They had ſome Pagan Stoical notions, as the Phariſees alſo had, as the doctrine of fate, and the Pythagorean tranſmigration of ſouls; and therefore they offered no living creature in ſacrifice; and would not take away the life of any creature leſt they ſhould diſpoſſeſs the ſouls of ſome of their anceſtors. They did not marry, becauſe they thought no woman could be faithful to one man, which was a notion too unfavourable; but they adopted, and brought up other people's children. See Joſephus's antiquities; Stackhouſe and Millar's hiſtory of the Bible, and Prideaux's connections, &c.

That period of the Jewiſh church after the time that they had no prophets to guide them till the appearance of the Baptiſt, which was a

about 400 years, may be called the modern and fluctuating period of it, when they ſplit into various opinions and parties, by differing in their notions of the law. At the time wherein Chriſt appeared the Jews were in a very diſtracted ſtate, and very corrupt, as well as the world in general; yet both the Jews and the reſt of the world, particularly the neighbouring nations, had high expectations of the Meſſiah. The Jews underſtood from the prophets that the time of his appearance was at hand; and the Gentiles heard the report thereof, but their pride, ambition, vanity, and earthly-mindedneſs, made them totally miſtake the prophecies concerning the manner of his appearing. Theſe prophecies that ſpeak of him as a Prince and a Conqueror, that would ſubject all nations to his ſpiritual kingdom, they underſtood literally; imagining he was to be an earthly monarch, to reſcue them from the Roman yoke, and ſubject all nations to them. And though his bright and ſhining example, his divine doctrine, his many miracles, and mighty works, all conſpired to convince them he was the Son of God, and promiſed Meſſiah; yet they were ſo offended at his mean parentage, and poor humble life, that they would not acknowledge him as their Meſſiah, and receive him, but called him a Galilean and a Nazarite. They did not mean one of that religious order, ſome of which were Nazarites for a time, and others for life, as Sampſon and Samuel, but that he was of the city Nazareth in Galilee, the moſt deſpiſed part of their country, though he was born in Bethlehem, and only

reſided in Nazareth of Galilee. Yea, they called him a Samaritan, as if he had not been of Jewiſh deſcent, according to the prophecies of him.

The Samaritans were mongrels, or a mixed people, both as to their nation and religion, partly Heathens and partly Jews; and though they acknowledged the law of God contained in the five books of Moſes, and alſo the being of angels, which was more than the Sadducees did, yet they rejected traditions, denied the reſurrection and immortality; and becauſe they ſet up a temple, altar, and ſacrifices, on mount Gerizzim, in oppoſition to that at Jeruſalem, which became a receptacle of mal-content, or apoſtate Jews, they hated them above all mankind, and would not even converſe with them, and held them accurſed from God, and all hope of his favour for ever. And as Chriſt condemned their hypocriſy, errors, and corruptions of the law, this kindled their rage and malice ſo that they perſecuted him to death, and got him condemned to ſuffer like the worſt of malefactors, tho' the Roman judge declared him innocent; and thus they fulfilled the prophecies concerning him. However, they are at a loſs to expound the prophecies concerning his ſufferings, as Iſ. liii. &c. and therefore fancied a two-fold Meſſiah, one the ſon of David, a triumphant conqueror, and another the ſon of Joſeph, a humble ſufferer; which was an acknowledgment that Meſſiah was both to ſuffer and to triumph, and to have a two-fold ſtate, a humble and an exalted one. What abſurd ſhifts will men uſe to ſupport their

vain fancies and falſe opinions! And tho' many of the Jews were converted to Chriſtianity, the bulk of them yet reject it, and ſtill expect their Meſſiah to come. With them we come now to treat, and the foundation of our arguments here are the prophecies concerning him; theſe are many, but one or two will ſerve the purpoſe.

Jacob, when dying, propheſied, that the ſcepter ſhould not depart from Judah till Shiloh come, but they muſt acknowledge that it is departed in every form long ago. A race of kings continued in the tribe of Judah till the captivity, and after it they had judges for their magiſtrates, and the ſanhedrim as a court of judicature, till the laſt deſtruction of Jeruſalem. Herod, of the race of Edom, and therefore a foreigner, became their king about the time Chriſt appeared, or ſome time before it. Secondly, Daniel's weeks, chap. ix. 24. from whoever of the Perſian king's decrees they be dated. are elapſed long ago; 70 prophetic weeks being 490 years, a day for a year. Now either the Meſſiah muſt be come, or their ſcriptures and prophets muſt be falſe; and it is the moſt ſtrange and inconſiſtent thing in the world, that they will acknowledge neither of the two. See the great Dr Owen's Exercitations preliminary to his Expoſition of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, Dr Prideaux's Connections, and Dr M'Queen's Computation of Daniel's weeks.

The Jews themſelves are a proof of the verity of Moſes and Chriſt's prophecies concerning them, as the things they predicted are accompliſhed in them, Deut. xxviii. Matth. xxiv.

Luke xxi. They are ſcattered over all nations, and are perhaps as numerous as of old in Canaan, and may be conſidered as the nerves of commerce. They generally marry young, as they hold celibacy an accurſed ſtate. They are a wonderful phænomenon in providence. None can now boaſt of being deſcended of any of the four great monarchies; and yet they are a diſtinct people, though none had ever greater reaſon to diſown the name, when all the world conſpired their deſtruction, and yet they are preſerved for ſome providential purpoſe. Not only their religion, but their manner of living, keeps them ſeparate from all people, for they eat not what others do. They are generally rich, being diligent in buſineſs, and having ſtill a ſhare of the temporal bleſſing. They have no poſſeſſions any where, and are ready waiting for their own land; and it ſeems to be ready awaiting them, as it is almoſt waſte; and it ſeems to be the ſenſe of many prophecies concerning them, that when they turn to the Lord, or embrace the goſpel, they will return to it. (See Newton, &c. on prophecies.) As they want an altar, they can offer no ſacrifice, and therefore they chiefly obſerve moral duties; and though they have loſt the diſtinction of their tribes, yet they redeem the firſt-born. They are as ſuperſtitious about the Sabbath as their anceſtors, to neglect works of mercy on it. Their modes of worſhip are extremely different from their anceſtors, and very whimſical and ſuperſtitious.

During their 70 years captivity at Babylon, they became accuſtomed to the Chaldee, and

their original language became leſs familiar to them; ſo that when the law was read in the ſynagogue, it was alſo interpreted to them in the Chaldee. Ezra collected and arranged the books of the Old Teſtament. He tranſcribed them into the Chaldee letter, and added vowel-points for the uſe of the vulgar, to whom the Hebrew dialect was now become a foreign, or dead language; but not the preſent or Maſoretic ſyſtem, as they were the work of the Tiberienſian Maſoretics, ſeveral centuries after Chriſt; moſt likely on purpoſe to pervert the reading, and prevent Chriſtians producing evidences from the prophecies that the Meſſiah is come. But the points were never admitted into their great ſynagogue-Bibles, which they regard as the true exemplar of the original copies of the inſpired books, which were originally laid up in the temple; and the Samaritan letters, which are the original Hebrew ones, never had any points adjoined to them. See Dr Prideaux's Arguments, on theſe topics, in his Connections, which are unanſwerable; ſee alſo Cappellus, who has never been refuted.

WE come laſtly to conſider the Chriſtian religion, wherein it agrees with the Jewiſh, and alſo the Pagan and Mahometan hath already been obſerved. Though the law and the prophets are ſaid to be only until John, and he is

called the beginning of the goſpel of Chriſt, Mark i. 1, 2. Luke xvi. 16. yet he was but the morning-ſtar uſhering in the Sun of righteouſneſs, and as an harbinger to prepare the way for him. And though our Saviour's perſonal miniſtry may be conſidered as laying the foundation of the Chriſtian church, and the effuſion of the Spirit ten days after his aſcenſion as the ſolemn inauguration of it, yet his perſonal miniſtry was but the introduction to the diſpenſation of the goſpel, which could not fully commence till he finiſhed his work, and aroſe from the dead, and aſcended to heaven; and it properly commenced on the day of Pentecoſt, when the promiſe of the Spirit (John xiv. 16, 26. xvi. 7, 13. Acts i. 4, 8.) was accompliſhed. The promiſe of Chriſt was the foundation of the Old Teſtament-church, and that of the Spirit and his effuſion was the foundation of the New; as without the ſpiritual preſence of Chriſt, which is the light and the life of every believer, the church would be like a body without a ſpirit, dead; there would be nothing but ſpiritual darkneſs and death, (John i. 4.) or, at moſt, a lifeleſs formality.

The Chriſtian church was not to be confined to one nation or people, like the Jewiſh church, but to be Catholic, or univerſal; to comprehend both Jews and Gentiles, though to begin at Jeruſalem, as the goſpel was to be firſt offered to the Jews, Acts xiii. 46. The Old Teſtament-church could not be extended over all the earth, but was circumſcribed, from its very nature, to one country, as there was but one temple and altar where all the ſacrifices were to be offered;

and all the males were to preſent themſelves three times every year, which could not be done from every corner of the earth. As ſoon as Chriſtians began to multiply by the converſion of Jews and Gentiles, diverſity of opinions began to take place. The different opinions and parties among Pagans and Mahometans, whether they were for liberty or fatal neceſſity, were little or no more to be deplored than their whole ſchemes. The former idolatries of the Jews were truly deplorable, and their latter diviſions were alſo deplorable; but as each party had very abſurd tenets, it is a queſtion whether their diviſions or their errors were moſt deplorable. But as all theſe had a more dark, or leſs perfect light to walk by, and not being ſo ſtrictly bound by the law of love to maintain peace and unity, it was leſs to be wondered at: but the diſtraction of Chriſtians into ſuch a diverſity of opinions and parties is deplorable beyond expreſſion, and that there are ſo few that ſtrive to make peace, and heal breaches, Matth. v. 9. Eph. iv. 3,—6. One amiable man indeed ſays, He would willingly give every drop of his blood to cement the breaches of Proteſtants: and another undertook the toil and labour to travel through the different Proteſtant churches, at home and abroad, in order to heal their diviſions, and make peace among them. But, alas! the mark of Chriſt's diſciples (John iii 35.) ſeems to be loſt among all parties; they have broken the yoke, and burſt the bonds of love, and peace, and unity. That good man, and excellent hiſtorian, Rollin, was moved at viewing the taſk he had to perform, in writing

he hiſtory of Alexander's ſucceſſors, and thought he was much to be pitied in having to repreſent human nature in a light that was a diſgrace to her, as the horrid cruelties and treacheries committed by the moſt intimate friends and neareſt relations on one another ſhewed. But how much more pitiable and deplorable is the melancholy taſk of relating the errors, diviſions, and animoſities among them that profeſs to be the diſciples of the humble, meek, and lowly Jeſus, who was love itſelf!

As the malice and envy of Satan could not ſuffer him to ſee man at firſt enjoy happineſs in the favour of God in paradiſe, ſo it could not ſuffer him to ſee the ſecond Adam or his followers enjoy peace and unity, and made him have recourſe to both craft and force. Having failed in his attempt againſt Chriſt by art, he had recourſe to cruelty and perſecution; both which he alſo practiſed againſt the church by his wicked agents, in order to devour and ſwallow it up by a flood of perſecution, or internal diſtractions of error, ſchiſm, and profaneneſs. Hereſies began early in the church. Satan transforming himſelf into an angel of light, and his meſſengers falſe apoſtles, counterfeiting the apoſtles of Chriſt, ſowed tares early among the wheat. However, it muſt be obſerved, that all Chriſtians agree, that they obtain ſalvation only by Chriſt; but they differ about the way and manner of it, and in their notions about his perſon and prieſtly office, &c.; and in their modes of worſhip and church-government, and articles of

faith; ſome join their own merits with Chriſt's, but own they are accepted only by him.

As ſoon as proſyletes were made to Chriſtianity, from both Jews and Gentiles, a difference aroſe between them about the ceremonial law of Moſes. The Jewiſh converts were for retaining circumciſion and the Moſaic rites, as neceſſary to juſtification and ſalvation, Acts xv. 1, Gal. v. 3.; and imagined that the goſpel was only to be ſuperadded to it, as its complement to perfect or compleat it, and not to aboliſh it; as it was of divine inſtitution, they did not think it was to ceaſe, or be diſannulled. But this was not all; had they only obſerved it themſelves, and not been for impoſing it on the Gentile converts, it had been well; but, contrary to the doctrine of the apoſtles, they wanted to impoſe this yoke on the Gentile converts; which they were unwilling to receive, contrary to the liberty of the goſpel. The Epiſtles to the Romans and Galatians are examples of this, eſpecially the latter; in which the apoſtle argues with the Chriſtian Jews that had embraced the goſpel; in the former, he argues chiefly with the infidel Jews that had rejected it. The Judaizing teachers had the aſſurance even to condemn the great apoſtle for neglecting, and being againſt theſe ceremonies; and teaching the Gentiles, who wanted to hold faſt their Chriſtian liberty, not to ſubmit to them. And though the apoſtles, who had the gifts of inſpiration, prophecy, tongues, healing, and other miracles, were to teach and govern the church, they could not prevent error and diviſion. As the Jews had formerly

the prerogative of being the church and people of God, Rom. iii. 1. and ix. 4, 5. the apoſtle exhorted the Gentiles to ſome degrees of condeſcenſion to them, as they were made partakers of their privileges; but he chiefly preſſed to unity and mutual forbearance in things not eſſential. That the Jews ſhould not preſs the Gentiles to obſerve their ceremonies, though they chooſed to do it themſelves; and that the Gentiles ſhould not ſeparate from the Jews, though they obſerved ceremonies which they did not obſerve nor approve; and not make a ſchiſm, or rent in the communion of the church, for circumſtantial differences, as meats and days; but let every one do what ſeemed good to him in theſe matters, and not condemn thoſe that differed from him, much leſs ſeparate from them. (Rom. xiv.) Theſe differences were parallel to thoſe among Proteſtants, as we will ſee in our progreſs; but the Jewiſh and Gentile converts ſeparated from each other after the apoſtles deceaſe.

Chriſtians at firſt were looked upon by the world as a particular ſect of the Jews; and were generally called the ſect of the Nazarites from Jeſus of Nazareth; but afterwards the Jewiſh converts that obſerved the law of Moſes were ſo called. Together with the other ordinances of the law, they obſerved the Jewiſh Sabbath as well as the Chriſtian; though ſome obſerved the Jewiſh Sabbath only, as it only is commanded in ſcripture; and ſome ſects afterwards obſerved no Sabbath at all. Diverſity of opinions, hereſies, and ſectaries, were perhaps

more numerous in the primitive times than afterwards; ſome of theſe were rather deliriums of enthuſiaſts than hereſies; which it would be ridiculous to refute, as they refute themſelves. Some thought, that none were meet for heaven but ſuch as lived in celibacy, and had a community of goods; and that Chriſtian liberty conſiſted in having all things common; accordingly ſome ſects conſiſted only of ſingle perſons, who would admit none that were married, as being thereby rendered incapable of the kingdom of heaven. Some condemned the eating of fleſh, milk, eggs, &c.; ſome prayed none, others had no ordinances but prayer. Some worſhipped Satan, that he might do them no hurt; ſome held that matter was made by Satan, and therefore would kill themſelves, to be rid of the fleſh, the cauſe of all evil, or at leaſt uſe ſeverities on their bodies; and that the world was made againſt the will, or without the knowledge of God: ſome condemned labour and ſociety, and thought they could not be Chriſtians if they did not live in ſolitude. The Abelites married from Platonic love as it is called, for mere ſpeculation: *Conſenſus ſine concubitu fecit matrimonium inter illos:* Some uſed both circumciſion and baptiſm, and circumciſed both males and females; ſome ſaid Chriſt was the ſerpent that deceived Eve; ſome impoſtors ſaid they were God the Father; others, that they were Meſſiah; others, that they were the Holy Ghoſt. The Manters of late ſaid there was neither God nor devil, heaven nor hell; others ſaid there was no material world; ſome of theſe aroſe ſuddenly,

and ſoon diſappeared; ſome mixed Paganiſm, and others Judaiſm, with Chriſtianity; and others both, as the Romaniſts. There was ſcarce any Pagan notion ſo abſurd but it was retained by Chriſtians bred up with it before their converſion. (See Roſs' Hiſtory of all Religions, Hereſies, and Sectaries, ſince the Creation.)

Paſſing over a great many hereſies, or wild and abſurd notions, that are too ridiculous to need refutation, as the foregoing, and others ſimilar to them; as it does not conſiſt with our plan to take notice of them all, we ſhall conſider only the chief of them that have been revived in in latter times, under various denominations and modifications; and have infeſted the church under the diſguiſe of new ſhapes, or a new dreſs. We intended alſo to have conſidered the errors and parties ſeparately, but find it will be more commodious to conſider both as we go along. We ſhall reduce the principal hereſies in doctrine, worſhip, and church-government, ſchiſm and libertiniſm, into claſſes, as much as may be expedient or convenient.

A part of the Jewiſh converts, that adhered to the rites of the ceremonial law, became Ebionites. Ebion, ſo called from his affected poverty, it being a Hebrew word, ſignifying poor, rejected all the New Teſtament but Matthew's goſpel, becauſe it was written in Hebrew; he alſo denied the divinity of Chriſt; aſſerted that he was a mere man, deſcended from Joſeph and Mary by ordinary generation; that Chriſt was the Spirit that deſcended on Jeſus at his baptiſm, and abode with him. Cerinthus held alſo the

ſame notion concerning Chriſt's divinity; he is alſo ſaid to be the father of the Chiliaſts, or Millenaries; but he and his aſſociates did not think the millennium, or reign of 1000 years of Chriſt and the martyrs, who were to riſe ſo long before the reſt, was to be on earth, but in ſome celeſtial region, where ſome heretics thought Paradiſe was. In oppoſition to Ebion and Cerinthus John is ſaid to have written his goſpel; in almoſt every page of which, ſays a celebrated commentator, he ſcatters ſome evidences of Chriſt's divinity. Various were the errors concerning the perſon, natures, offices, and merits of the Mediator, broached by various heretics, but that concerning his divinity is the chief of them; we ſhall therefore conſider it firſt, and the principal abettors of it, both in ancient and modern times. After Ebion, the names of Arius of Alexandria in the eaſt, in the beginning of the fourth century, and of Sozzo, or Fauſtus Socinus in Italy, in the weſt, in the ſixteenth century, are the moſt famous; and thoſe that imbibe their notions have the honour to be called by their names, Arians, and Socinians; but they differ from one another, and each party alſo diſagree among themſelves. Arius aſſerted, that the divine nature of Chriſt was not eternal, but was created by the Father before the world was created, and that then only he became a Father. He involved himſelf in an inconſiſtency, denying him to be really God, and making a creature God. Having got the Emperor and the civil power on his ſide, he raiſed a hot perſecution againſt the Trinitarians, the chief of whom

was Athanaſius; it was the firſt formal perſecution of Chriſtians againſt one another. This hereſy and perſecution is ſaid to have done more hurt to the church than the ten perſecutions by the Pagans. Their contention and diviſion made them a reproach to the world.

Arius was condemned for hereſy by the firſt general council, which was held at Nice, in Bythinia, for that purpoſe in 325, conſiſting of 318 biſhops; at which Conſtantine the Great, the firſt Roman Emperor that embraced Chriſtianity, was preſent, and with whom the empire or civil government became Chriſtian. The Arians differed widely among themſelves; ſome of them, called ſemi-arians, that is, half-arians, held, that the divine nature of Chriſt was homoiuſios, or of a like eſſence to the Father's, but not homouſios, of the ſame eſſence.

Socinus went far beyond Arius, he held, that Chriſt was only a mere man; he allowed his prophetic, and his example, but denied his prieſtly office; and held, that redemption, atonement, and ſacrifice, &c. were only metaphorical expreſſions; and that he died only as a martyr, to confirm his doctrine; but he made him a God by office, and allowed divine worſhip to him, tho' a creature; thus he admitted his inſtruction, example, and government; he alſo denied the divinity and perſonality of the Holy Spirit; he and his followers held him either to be a created ſpirit, or a divine virtue, power, or influence of God the Father. Socinus had many other peculiar notions, about the conſtitution of the Chriſtian church, the ſacraments, &c. and

denied the reſurrection of the body, and rejected infant-baptiſm, &c. contrary to expreſs ſcripture teſtimony; but his followers differ among themſelves, and many of them admit infant-baptiſm, &c.; this ſect were called Unitarians, as they allowed but of one perſon in the divine eſſence. The particular places of ſcripture concerning Chriſt's divinity could with leſs difficulty be ſtrained or reduced to the Arian hypotheſis, but could not poſſibly be reduced to the Socinian, without open violence.

The Socinians allow of revelation, but are conſidered as a kind of inconſiſtent Deiſts, aſſerting the perfection of human nature, and that man errs only by example, and therefore needed only a right example to follow; and the example of Chriſt is propoſed as a pattern even by ſome Deiſts who deny his prophetic office and revelation. Socinus was hard put to it to explain the beginning of John's goſpel, but happened to fall on a curious hypotheſis for it, and acknowledged he had happened on more than ordinary ſubtilty, which himſelf wondered at. "In the beginning," he held to be that of the Baptiſt's miniſtry, "the Word was with God," in unity of affection, will, and purpoſe, but not of eſſence; and he allowed Chriſt to be God by office. All things in the goſpel-ſtate, or new creation, viz. the introduction and eſtabliſhment of Chriſtianity, were by him made to be; and Crellius Schiltingius, and all the troop of his diſciples, follow his example herein; and yet many of theſe enter into, and continue in the communion of churches, of what are called the Atha-

naſian; and, in modern times, in the reformed church; the Calviniſtic principles; as all the creeds and confeſſions of all churches are of theſe principles, and all ſyſtems of Divinity, except a few that are Armenian; for though the Socinians publiſhed one in Tranſilvania in the 16th century, yet ſince they declare againſt ſyſtems, and yet at admiſſion they profeſs to be of the faith of theſe churches. And in communions that uſe no ſuch formularies, they profeſs to believe the ſcripture doctrines; and ſome of them ſeem to be men of parts and learning. Now, tho' ſome men of genius, or that would be thought to excel others, thro' ſingularity, a deſire of novelty, and curioſity, will rather carve out a new path for themſelves, though a wrong one, than go in the right way with others; yet when we ſee conſiderable men differ from us, we ſhould ſuſpect we may be wrong, and examine what are the grounds of our belief; and not take things for granted, nor through pride or ſingularity think or wiſh ſuch a way right, or that we may ſee it ſo, for that is endeavouring to continue wrong, if we are ſo. We ſhould like beſt what is right, and not take up a prejudice at one thing, and an attachment to another, from fancy. Falſe principles are dangerous, as well as bad practices. We ſhall therefore examine this point with the utmoſt candour and impartiality.

It is better to be right, though alone, than wrong, with the multitude. Dr Owen calls this article the hinge on which the faith and ſalvation of the church depends; and if it be rejected, not another article can remain uncorrupted; ſo

that the believing of it muſt either be a fundamental miſtake, or the rejecting of it a fundamental error, influencing the whole of the Chriſtian faith and the doctrine of the goſpel. We ſhall therefore conſider the matter candidly and liberally, taking an extenſive view of it from reaſon and ſcripture, and weigh the objections in their full force.

The objections to this article, and the method of arguing againſt it, is this: That reaſon muſt be the rule for underſtanding and interpreting ſcripture, as it is the rule in judging what is ſcripture, viz. the evidences of revelation; and if any ſcripture ſeems contrary to our reaſon, it muſt be underſtood in another ſenſe. And it is contrary to reaſon, that three can be one, and one three, and that a ſon can be equal in every reſpect to a father; he muſt at leaſt be poſterior to him, as he is produced by him, and derived from him. Theſe, I think, are the arguments and objections, fairly ſtated and repreſented in their full force. The queſtion about the merit of his ſacrifice and atonement, from the virtue of his divinity, will occur afterwards. The difference between the oppoſite parties ariſes partly from an imperfect and miſtaken view of the doctrine from reaſon and ſcripture, and partly from ignorance of the extent of our capacities. It was obſerved on the Deiſtical and Atheiſtical controverſies, how little adequate our capacities are to underſtand the works of God, and much leſs ſo to comprehend what God is himſelf, and the manner of his exiſtence. A part cannot contain the whole. An ancient philoſopher being

aſked what God was, deſired a day to conſider it, and when that was done, he aſked two more, and ſo on, ſaying, the more he ſtudied the more difficult it was to him. The way we attain to any knowledge of other ſpirits, is by reflecting on our own, and on what paſſes in our minds, and from a ſuppoſed analogy we form ſome conception of others. Metaphyſicians cannot compare minds or ſpirits as phyſicians or anatomiſts do bodies. Every power, capacity, or faculty, we diſcover in our minds, we conſider as analogous to ſome attribute in the divine nature; and by adding infinity to theſe, we form our idea of God. We have ſome degree of power, wiſdom, goodneſs, &c. and we conſider the Deity as being infinite in theſe; that is, we exclude the idea of imperfection from him, and ſpeak negatively concerning him; we ſay rather what he is not, than what he is. We exiſt in time and place, and by adding infinity to theſe, we ſay God is eternal and immenſe, or omnipreſent, and therefore omniſcient. We have ſome idea of an eternity to come, that is, a potential eternity, as we are capable of it, and ſo have a virtual eternity; but we can form no idea of an eternity paſt, or an actual eternity; for we muſt conceive of paſt duration as once preſent, and at ſome certain diſtance from us, and what is at any certain diſtance from us cannot be eternity. In like manner, we have no idea of a trinity in unity, or of unity exiſting in trinity, as we have nothing analogous to it in our ſpirits. We have indeed a trinity, conſiſting of the material body, the ſenſitive, or animal ſoul, and the rational one,

exiſting in the unity of our perſons, but theſe are of diverſe natures. In the ſun, which is the brighteſt image of God among all his works, there is alſo a trinity, which is more analogous to that in the divine nature; in it there is fire, that active principle of a ſubtile nature, which the philoſophers thought pervaded all nature. It has the neareſt reſemblance, or greateſt analogy to the nature of a ſpirit; and the Jews held it at leaſt the reſidence of God, as Dr Boerhaave in his chymiſtry obſerves: and God is ſaid in ſcripture to be a conſuming fire to the wicked. (Indeed, all the regions of the heavens, aerial, ethereal, and empyrean, are of a ſubtile nature; the firſt called Shamaim in the Hebrew, as conſiſting of eſh, fire; and maim, waters; as the region of the meteors, clouds, lightning, &c.; the ſecond is the region of celeſtial bodies, the ſtarry frame, &c.; and the third, called empyrean, as denoting its quality, is the habitation of the bleſſed.) In the ſun is alſo light, which is ſo analogous, or ſimilar to fire, that it is diſputed by philoſophers whether they are not the ſame differently exhibited; and the ſecond Perſon in the Trinity is called Light. In the ſun is alſo air, or wind, which is conſiſtent with fire and light, and without the conjunction of which they could not ſubſiſt or exiſt; and the very name of the third Perſon in the original, and alſo in the Roman language, ſignifies air. But there can be no adequate repreſentation of the Deity found among all his works, it is impoſſible that ſuch a thing could be, finite and infinite cannot be ſimilar. Some phyſiologiſts obſerve, that there is a ter-

narian conſiſtency in every thing in nature; and Sir Humphry Mackworth, on the Trinity, obſerves, that this is the perfection of unity, triunity; and that though God be ſolus as to the nature of his exiſtence, yet he is not ſolitarius as to the manner of it.

The trinity of the philoſophers and poets was much more ancient than Plato, and communicated by tradition from the ancient patriarchs, and derived firſt from revelation. Hence Virgil ſays, *Deus in impari numero gaudet triſmegiſtus.* See Cudworth's Intellectual Syſtem, Gale, More, &c. But the ſcripture ſenſe of this doctrine is totally miſtaken and miſrepreſented by both Athanaſians and Arians, or Trinitarians and Antitrinitarians, for they take the doctrine by halves, and this partial imperfect view leads them to abſurdities in ideas and expreſſions: and the Arians expreſs the very ſenſe of the other's words, and ſeem to take their ideas from them, and not from ſcripture; and therefore it is abſurd in them to blame the Arians for hereſy, when they led them to that hereſy by their own expreſſions. They affirm that the Son is equal to the Father; now, that a ſon can be equal to a father in every reſpect, is ſo palpable an abſurdity, that all men of reaſon and common ſenſe muſt diſcern it. The unity, eternity, ſelf-exiſtence, and neceſſary exiſtence, independency, ſelf-ſufficiency, immenſity, omnipotency, infinite wiſdom, goodneſs, and other perfections of God, as well as his being, were manifeſted by the works of creation. His holineſs, juſtice, patience, and ſovereignty, were in ſome degree, manifeſted in providence; but

the moſt amiable perfections or properties of the divine nature, as well as the Trinity, were only manifeſted by the goſpel, as redeeming love, pardoning mercy and grace. What the internal, eternal, real manner of ſubſiſtence, or relation of the Perſons (the word perſon being uſed for want of a better) in the divine eſſence is to each other we know not, it is not diſcovered, and perhaps could not be conceived by creatures; but the manner of ſubſiſtence, or rather the relations mentioned in ſcripture, are entirely economical, as is evident from the whole ſcope of the ſcripture, and they refer only to the ſcheme of redemption; and it is by a partial view in taking relatives for abſolutes, and, on the contrary, ſeparating things connected that ſhould not be ſeparated, and taking a part for the whole, that the miſtake aroſe on both ſides. The titles Father, Son, Spirit, are aſſumed to repreſent the diſtinct agencies, or the different parts they act in the goſpel-ſcheme, each having a part aſcribed to them; and the term perſon, ſubſiſtence, or hypoſtaſis, is uſed to convey a diſtinct idea. The Father is ſaid to plan, appoint, or ordain, the Son to purchaſe, and the Holy Ghoſt to apply this redemption; and no other titles or terms could have ſo properly expreſſed their fitneſs to perform each their part of that work in a mutual relation, and in conjunction. Jehovah expreſſes the ſelf-exiſtence, or neceſſary exiſtence; Ihejeh, or I am, the immutability, Jah the excellency, El the might, Eloah the venerableneſs, Elohim denotes the mutual relation to man, and condeſcenſion to him, and the homage due from

him; Adoni denotes the ſovereignty, Lord denotes government, God denotes bounty; but the title Father implies the neareſt relation and warmeſt affection, and alſo compaſſion to children in diſtreſs and miſery, and denotes authority over a ſon. The title Son implies willing obedience to the authority of a father, from love, and not from conſtraint; and alſo fraternal affection to children of the ſame father, ſo as to defend or deliver them from evil; and Spirit is the quickening principle that gives life, and revives any thing. Man's ſtate of miſery is repreſented by death being ſpiritually ſo. Spirit is alſo the proper denomination of the divine nature or eſſence; but he is called the Holy Spirit, particularly with regard to his ſanctifying and quickening work, as man's miſery is called ſpiritual death, he gives life.

We find eternal Spirit, but not eternal Father or eternal Son in ſcripture, as it is the abſolute title of God, or of the divine nature. But as the purpoſe of redemption, in the plan of the divine government, was before the production of any creature, or the world's creation, therefore theſe relations took place before it, and imply a ſubordination, or inequality; ſo that in this relative economical ſtate, there are ſuperior and inferior, though really it be not ſo. And this double relation is evident from ſcripture; ſo when the ſcriptures ſpeaks abſolutely of any of theſe hypoſtaſes in the divine eſſenſe, it aſcribes the names, attributes, works, and worſhip, of the ſupreme Deity to them, in the abſolute and higheſt ſenſe, Iſaiah ix. 6. Jer. xxiii. 6. Pſa

xxxiii. 18. Rom. ix. 5. Tit. ii. 13. John i. 1. John v. 20. Jude ver. 25. Mal. iii. 1. Acts xx. 28.—Micah v. 2. John xxi. 17. Heb. xiii. 8. Rev. i. 8. Matth. xxviii. 20. Rom. ix. 5. John ii. 13. Heb. i. 11, 12.—John i. 3. Col. i. 16. Heb. iii. 3, 4. John v. 28, 29. Rom. xiv. 10. Mark ii. 5. v. 41. Heb. i. 3.—John v. 23. xiv. 1. Heb. i. 6. Matth. iv. 10. xxviii. 19. Pſal. ii. 12. Acts vii. 59. Phil. ii. 6. John x. 30.—Acts v. 4. Cor. iii. 16. Acts xxviii. 25, 26. 2 Sam. xxiii. 2, 3. Num. xii. 6. 2 Pet. i. 21.—Heb. ix. 14. Cor. ii. 10, 12. vi. 9, 10, 11. Pſal. cxxxix. 7.—Pſal. xxxiii. 6. civ. 30. Luke i. 35. 2 Pet. i. 21. John xvi. 13. Rom. xv. 3. Matth. xii. 28. Rom. viii. 11. 2 Pet. i. 21. Matth. xxviii. 19. 2 Cor. xiii. 14.—1 John ii. 23. Rom. viii. 9. John xiv. 17.

But again, when it ſpeaks in the relative and economical ſenſe, it ſpeaks of inequality, or ſuperiority and inferiority, ſubjection and obedience; and this with regard to the Son did not commence with his incarnation, or aſſumption of the human nature, as a late ingenious author ſuppoſes, but the title of Son is previous to that, and to the creation of the world, as the purpoſe or plan of redemption was, (John i. 18.); whatever was before time, muſt be conſidered as eternal. Each of them are repreſented as acting a different part, that requires ſubordination; and thereby they are relatively and economically unequal, though originally ~~and~~ *not* really ſo; and in attending to this diſtinction alone that ſolves the difficulty, and reconciles ſcripture expreſſions.

A corruption in the doctrine of the Trinity

produces a corruption in the faith, worſhip, and obedience of the goſpel; for the object of theſe is changed, by either the Anti-trinitarian, or Tritheiſtical ſcheme. It is difficult to avoid extremes; flying one, we run to another; all extremes are equally dangerous.

Jehovah is the incommunicable name of God, never given to any creature; and the name Jehovah in the Old Teſtament is rendered Jeſus and Chriſt in the New, in ſeveral places; as in Numb. xxi. 6. compared with 1 Cor. x. 9. Pſal. cvi. 14. Iſaiah vi. compared with John xii. 41. The name Jehovah expreſſes the ſelf-exiſtence, and neceſſary exiſtence of God, and his eternity, both actual and potential; and therefore is incommunicable to any creature, as Ehejeh and Jah alſo are. The Jews held the name Jehovah in ſuch veneration that they would mention it only once a-year on the great day of atonement, their moſt ſolemn occaſion. The names El, Eloah, Elohim, Adoni, are given to angels and men, to denote the excellency of certain offices they are clothed with as God's vicegerents, and therefore they poſſeſs his communicable names and authority. It is a maxim with the beſt Hebreans, that a true Hebrean cannot be an Arian, or erroneous in the doctrine of the Trinity. And not only the ſcripture doctrines, but alſo the natural theology, and the mythology of the Pagans, as well as the Jewiſh hieroglyphics, emblems, &c. cannot be underſtood without the knowledge of the Hebrew. The Pagans applied the Hebrew terms to their own purpoſes, and derived their notions from them

as from Alah, Shemim, Cherubim, Hets, Hatſab, &c. It will readily be objected, that a late ingenious writer, Dr T. who is reckoned a diſguiſed Socinian, and is even openly ſo in ſome things, muſt be a good Hebrean, as he has publiſhed a large elaborate work on it; but he never entered into the ſpirit of the Hebrew, nor diſcovered what the genius of it is, nor even the powers of the characters; but tranſlated the work of another, with the variation and addition of ſome little circumſtances; his arrangement is alſo borrowed.

2*dly*, It is impoſſible for a Maſoretic to be a Hebrean, his erroneous plan puts an effectual bar in his way to the diſcovery of either the true meaning of words, or the true genius of the language. (Hutchinſon, Maſclef, and thoſe of their ſchemes, deviate alſo to the other extreme.) Dr T. thinks he has ſettled the true meaning of atonement from the Hebrew original, and by the help of his publication on it; but he only ſhews his entire ignorance of the eaſtern phraſeology, and emblematical hieroglyphical manner of inſtruction, and of expreſſing themſelves, and the ſcripture and levitical doctrine of atonement; and is ſo inconſiſtent with himſelf in that book, as to be Socinian, Arian, Arminian, and Calviniſt, by turns. He alſo totally miſunderſtands Paul's plan, in the Epiſtles to the Romans, &c. though he thinks he only has hit it. Paul's natural parts and abilities were ſuperior to his; he was taught philoſophy and poetry, in a celebrated ſchool at Tarſus, before he ſtudied divinity at Jeruſalem, under the famous Gamaliel;

his Epiſtle to Philemon, &c. ſhew his natural genius ſuperior to moſt men; beſides his ſupernatural endowments of inſpiration and miracles, &c. The doctor's key, and grand key to the Epiſtles, is only a lock, and a grand lock to ſuch as will uſe them. In ſhort, the doctor underſtood not the goſpel-ſcheme, though he was an amiable good man, and an excellent muſician, who underſtood ſounds well, and writes well on muſic, and alſo performed well. The doctor, and others of his way of thinking, think they have found out how the Father, Son, and Spirit, are one; being united in affection and deſign, as good men are, John xvii. 21, 22. The doctor is right, ſo far as he goes here, but from other parts of ſcripture he will find more than this. He thinks alſo he has found out how Chriſt bore our ſins, from the application or accommodation of Iſaiah liii. in Matth. viii. 17. which ſpeaks only of ſickneſſes, and not of ſins; and by bearing them, the removing of them, by healing the patient. The Hebrew verb in Iſaiah, is indeed applicable to both, but the doctor ſhews only his ignorance of it; had he attended to the ſcape-goat, and the rabbins account of the end of it, it would have taught him the twofold and ſecondary meaning; like that of the Pſalmiſt in Acts ii. 24.; literally there were no pains in the grave, but the Hebrew word ſignifies both pains and cords. See the learned pious and judicious Dr Erſkine's diſſertations on the Sinai covenant, in which he obſerves, that Dr T.'s metaphors are very great, and his privileges very ſmall. It was obſerved, that the Arians

taking the relative and economical titles and relations ſeparately from the real ones, and for them, as if nothing more than theſe were contained in ſcripture; and the Athanaſians confounding them, and taking the one for the other promiſcuouſly, bred the miſtake. Arius allowed of Chriſt's prieſtly office and atonement, which Socinus and Dr T. deny, ſaying that the virtues of the life of Chriſt are the blood of Chriſt. The particular texts for this purpoſe are wreſted from their obvious ſenſe, by making them figurative, and to ſpeak what they never meant, or elſe they cry out interpolations. I ſhall not reſt the argument againſt interpolations only on the care of providence for the ſcriptures and the church, as ſome do, who think that providence would ſooner ſuffer the frame of nature to be maimed by the devil and his agents than the ſcriptures, and that it were better they were deſtroyed than corrupted; better no rule, than a falſe one to deceive; and indeed the worldly powers all conſpired utterly to deſtroy the book of God, as well as his church. And tho' the external viſible church may have many corrupt members, in doctrine, faith, worſhip, &c. yet the members of the inviſible church, being taught by the Spirit, are led into all truth. But I ſhall uſe a moral argument; though the fathers, and other human writings, that were uſed chiefly, when firſt publiſhed, and in that part of the church where they reſided, might ſuffer by tranſcribers, either through deſign or otherwiſe, yet it was morally impoſſible the ſcriptures could be corrupted this way, as

in the primitive churches they were read every day; and whilſt there were few human eccleſiaſtic writers, they were ſo much peruſed, that many were able to repeat the Pſalms and Proverbs, &c. in the Old Teſtament, and all the New. What the whole church uſed every day, and peruſed ſo much, if any interpolations had happened, the alarm would have been univerſal, and an outcry would have immediately been made every where. It would have been as impoſſible for copiators then to have corrupted the ſcriptures by frauds, either pious or malicious, as it would now be to corrupt our catechiſms, liturgies, creeds, confeſſions, &c. And at the reformation, when tranſlations were made into the modern languages, they had MSS. of the early ages; and any various readings found by the doctors Kenicott and Mill could not have been in copies that were of public uſe in the church, but by thoſe that were tranſcribed by ſome private hands for private uſe; nor are any of theſe of importance, or in things eſſential: and the Jews took ſuch care of the Old Teſtament, that they can tell how often every word, if not every letter, occurs in it.

Beſides vindicating the ſcriptures againſt the charge of interpolations, &c. corruptions, we muſt alſo have rules of interpretation fixed, in order to ſettle and decide controverſies by them. The following are unqueſtionable:

1*ſt*, The letter and conſtruction of the text, and analogy of the language.

2*dly*, The analogy of the text, or ſcope of the

place; that is, the connection of what goes before and follows after.

3*dly*, The analogy of doctrine, in ſcripture called the analogy of faith; for every author muſt have his meaning opened with a key from himſelf. The Stoics and Pythagoreans ſpoke both of the immortality of the ſoul, as well as other philoſophers, but then they muſt be underſtood in their own ſenſe.

4*thly*, The literal ſenſe muſt never be departed from without neceſſity.

5*thly*, All ſcripture is either literal or figurative; the literal muſt be taken or underſtood juſt as it is expreſſed; it admits of no explication; the Author of the ſcripture knew how to adapt it to the capacity of them for whom it was deſigned; it may be diſcourſed from, or applied, but it is abſurd to ſpeak of explaining it.

6*thly*, Figurative ſcripture cannot be uſed to eſtabliſh any point of faith, or confirm any doctrine, as it is not to be underſtood as it is expreſſed; the meaning or ſenſe is firſt to be found out and ſettled, before it can be applied, and therefore it ſerves only for inſtruction. Theſe are univerſal and unexceptionable rules.

7*thly*, The general rule to know figurative ſcripture is, that it would imply an abſurdity, if taken literally, as Ezek. xix. Matth. viii. 22.

Thoſe that would make any ſcripture figurative, or allegorize every ſcripture, make it indeed a noſe of wax, and twiſt it into any form or ſhape. Thus the church of Rome finds ſeveral ſenſes in every ſcripture, as the grammatical, hiſtorical, allegorical, anagogical, tropological,

&c.; thus Jeruſalem ſignifies the viſion of peace, the metropolis of Judea, the church-militant, the church-triumphant, an upright ſoul, &c.; and if the literal ſenſe be againſt them, it is not to be underſtood in that ſenſe, but they are ſure to find ſome other ſenſe for them. Thus heretics would allegorize and evaporate the ſymbolic emblematic goſpel, or types and figures of the Old Teſtament, and alſo the literal goſpel of the New Teſtament, and make the inſpired writers ſpeak figurative, bombaſt, hyperbolic, unmeaning expreſſions, rather than plain ſenſe, only to amuſe and delude the reader and believer. See Dr Watts's Redeemer and Sanctifier. And reaſon is as much perverted and miſapplied in falſe argumentation, by theſe ſubtile ſophiſters, as ſcripture is; to ſupport their fond imaginations, and the opinions they have eſpouſed; and they who unjuſtly blame others for corrupting the ſcriptures, by making interpolations in the text, which is a moral impoſſibility, wreſt and pervert their plain and obvious meaning, by making interpolations in the ſenſe, or curtailing it, contrary to the rules of interpretation. That 1 John v. 7. is not an interpolation, as is alledged is ſhewn by Stackhouſe, in the firſt volume of his Body of Divinity; but none will alledge that the form of baptiſm and the doxology are ſuch, Matth. xxviii. 19. 1 Cor. xiii. 14. Theſe texts plainly intimate, that there are three hypoſtaſes, or a threefold manner of ſubſiſtence in the divine eſſence, a triune, or trinity in unity, which we ſhall call three diſtinct Perſons, (for want of a better word) all divine. But tho' all the par-

ticular texts were taken away, yet the ſubſtance of the doctrine remains. There are diſtinct perſonal acts aſcribed to each of them, John xiv. 16. xvi. 7. And therefore the Holy Spirit of God cannot be only a power, virtue, quality, or influence, though it is ſometimes ſo to be underſtood in ſcripture, by a metonymy of the act, or effect for the agent or efficient; yet there are many places where it can neither be underſtood of God the Father, nor his operation, or efficacy, nor a virtue perſonified, like charity in 1 Cor. xiii. as John xv. 26. Rom. viii. 27. Mat. xii. 31. iii. 16. Eph. ii. 18. Gal. iv. 5.; and he is expreſsly called God in Acts v. 4. and is therefore a divine Perſon as the Son is, Heb. iii. 4. Rom. ix. 5. 1 Tim. iii. 16. 1 John v. 20.

The external operations in creation, providence, and government, are common indeed to the whole Trinity, as they poſſeſs the ſame infinite power, wiſdom, will, &c. perfections, which are common to all the Perſons; ſo that what the Father wills and works, the Son, &c. does alſo, John v. 17. xix. 23. That they are all divine and diſtinct Perſons is evident from the foregoing texts; for it would be abſurd, on the Sabellian ſcheme, of holding them to be only three economical titles of the ſame Perſon, to adminiſter baptiſm not in the name of three Perſons, but in the name of three economical titles of the ſame Perſon. There would be no benefit derived from three titles, but from the three Perſons are derived the benefits flowing from the love of the Father, the merits and interceſſion of the Son, and the ſanctification and conſolation of the

Spirit. It would be abſurd to adminiſter baptiſm in the name of a creature as well as of a virtue or title; and therefore ſome ancient heretics that denied Chriſt's divinity did not baptize in his name whom the church baptized again. (See Roſs's hiſtory of all religions,) and in ſo doing, ſuch heretics acted conſiſtently. Who would not think it abſurd to adminiſter baptiſm in the name of the bleſſed Virgin, or of the angel Gabriel, or in the name of a divine quality, if the Son were only a creature, and the Spirit only a divine virtue, influence, or quality? As the diſpenſing of baptiſm in the name of the Trinity is profeſſing love, obedience, worſhip, hope, truſt, dependence, *&c.* in each of the Perſons, and the expecting of the fore-mentioned benefits; ſo in like manner in the benediction pronounced in the name of each, there are ſpecial diſtinct bleſſings prayed for from each Perſon in their different relations. Arius, who allowed the Father only to poſſeſs ſupreme Deity, uſed the doxology in this form, Glory be to the Father by the Son in the Holy Ghoſt; different from the Chriſtian church, who uſed it in this form, Glory be to the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt.

That the ſecond Perſon, called the Son, aſſumed the whole human nature into union with his divine Perſon, ſo as to be both God and man; and that he did not only aſſume a human body, to which the divine nature was inſtead of a ſoul, is evident from ſcripture, Iſaiah ix. 6. 1 Tim. iii. 16. John i. 14. Heb. ii. 14, 16. Matt. i. 23. Matth. xxvi. 38. John xi. 33. Luke xxii.

46. Now the divine nature could not be ſorrowful, nor groan, nor be troubled.

Thus we have eſtabliſhed this doctrine on ſolid foundations, as it was taught by the apoſtles, the primitive churches, and all churches that were acknowledged as Chriſtian; as the denying the divinity of the Mediator was reckoned forfeiting a title to the name of Chriſtians. The Greek, Roman, and reformed churches, all agree in the profeſſion of this faith, and only ſome individuals, or particular parties, ever denied it. Thus Chriſt is a fit Mediator, or middle Perſon between God and man, to treat with them both, being himſelf both; and thus ſays a grave divine, More of the love of God, and of the condeſcenſion of Chriſt, a greater foundation for our peace, and more ground of hope and truſt in a Saviour, who is able to ſave to the uttermoſt, by his divine power, from all evils and enemies, as the devil, the world, ſin, death, and hell; and more cauſe of gratitude, is diſplayed in the Chriſtian ſcheme than in the Socinian.

We obſerved, that the Socinians not only deny the divinity, but the atonement of Chriſt; but this has been eſtabliſhed according to the preceding rules of interpretation, and is evident from both reaſon and ſcripture. As there can be no juſt foundation for remiſſion of ſins, without an adequate ſatisfaction, equivalent to the offence.

But Dr T. and others have no other idea of Chriſt's mediation than that of pleading in behalf of others, as Abraham and Moſes did; and thereby prevailed to the deferring, or preventing

temporal puniſhments; and thus every good man pleads in behalf of others. And as Chriſt did no ſin, or never offended, but always pleaſed the Father, he obtains on that account whatever he aſks; even pardon and favour for the greateſt ſinners. But this would make him only a Mediator of interceſſion; like the Papiſts, canonized ſaints and angels; and not a Mediator of redemption; contrary to the expreſs teſtimonies of ſcripture, that plainly declare he redeemed us by his precious blood from the curſe of the law, and delivered us from the wrath to come, and bore our ſins on his own body on the tree, and died for this end. 1 Pet. i. 18. Gal. iii. 13. Rev. v. 9. 1 Theſ. i. 10. 1 Pet. ii. 24. 1 Cor. xv. 3. Iſaiah liii. 5, 6. Dan. ix. 26. Col. i. 14.

It is blaſphemous to ſuppoſe that God would not execute the puniſhment he denounced againſt ſin, viz. the ſanction of the law; or that he would pardon it without an adequate ſatisfaction to juſtice, and the honour of the law; for thus he would be neither a God of truth nor juſtice. It implies alſo a comparative injuſtice or partiality in him. For it is not only inconſiſtent with the juſtice, and righteous government of God, to let crimes paſs without puniſhment, as it would encourage wickedneſs; but it is ſo alſo to let one paſs, and not another, or not all; for if he ſhould thus pardon one criminal, and not every one, angels as well as men he would be partial; therefore it is morally impoſſible for God, or inconſiſtent with his righteous government, not to require ſatisfaction to

juſtice and the law, according to the demerit of ſin; either from the ſinner or his ſurety being a voluntary ſubſtitute. But Dr T. and others, have no notion of transferring of guilt, or rather of the puniſhment of that guilt, and of vicarious puniſhment by ſubſtitution, and ſay it is contrary to all our ideas of things, that the innocent ſhould ſuffer for the guilty; but then it ſeems that theſe men have never lived in the ſociety of this world; but in a cloiſter, elſe they would have had the idea, and the practice of ſuretyſhip for debts, and other obligations. And the great apoſtle, when ſpeaking of Chriſt's ſuffering in our ſtead, and not merely as a martyr to confirm his doctrine, and ſet us an example of patience and fidelity, for our good; alludes to a practice of ſome ſubſtituting their perſons or lives in place of others. See inſtances of ſome pledging their lives for others, collected from records of facts in Pool and other commentators, on Rom. v. 7.; it is grace, or favour indeed, in any governor, or ſuperior, to accept a ſubſtitutional or proxy ſatisfaction for an offence; but it is no injuſtice done to the innocent, to take ſatisfaction of him by ſuffering for the guilty, when he voluntarily undertakes it; no more than to pay a debt as a ſurety when voluntarily undertaken; and this ſcheme gives greater glory to the grace of God, and love and condeſcenſion of Chriſt; and more ground for peace, and confidence, and gratitude, when the demands of the law are fully anſwered, and juſtice fully ſatisfied, as was obſerved before.

See Dr Watts's Redeemer and Sanctifier, and Butler's Analogy.

And though Chriſt's ſufferings were not eternal, or infinite in duration, as the unbelievers will be, as the object offended is infinite, yet the virtue of his divine nature gave infinite merit to them, to make them infinite in value, if not in degree; and ſufficient to ſatisfy the demands of the law, or atone for all ſins. Denying his atonement, is the natural conſequence of denying his divinity.

Socinus denied not only the divinity and atonement of Chriſt, but alſo the omniſcience of God, and the reſurrection of the body; which was alſo virtually denying God's omnipotency, contrary to the expreſs teſtimony of ſcripture, Pſal. cxxxix. cxlvii. 5. Prov. xv. 3. Job xi. 7. 1 Cor. xv. See Dr Clark on the attributes, and Dr Watts's Philoſophical Eſſays.

That the infinite power of God is able to frame anew the body diſſolved in duſt, and revive it, and his knowledge can diſtinguiſh the particles of one body from another, is evident; and the forementioned authors obſerve, that the ſtamina and ſubſtrata, or original principles of every body, cannot mix or be compounded with any other; and that they are the ſame in every age and ſize, being like tubes, that are only inflated or ſwelled in dimenſions by nouriſhment and growth. The denying of the reſurrection is an old hereſy, in the apoſtles days, and refuted by him. Some alſo held, that it was to be underſtood only in the figurative and ſpiritual ſenſe, and not literally alſo. Hymeneus, Phile

tus, Alexander, and ſome at Corinth, are recorded as denying this fundamental article.

The Gnoſtics, againſt whom John writes his firſt Epiſtle, the Nicolaitans, and Balaamites, mentioned in the Revelation, &c. we ſhall afterwards conſider with modern heretics of the ſame kind. There were various other hereſies concerning the Trinity, and the Mediator, and other doctrines, in early times, which are long ago extinct, and therefore need not refutation; and indeed they confuted themſelves, being not only theological errors, but ſelf-evident abſurdities, and phyſical impoſſibilities; as that of the Patripaſſians, who aſſerted that the Father ſuffered, as they held but one perſon in the Trinity. Others ſaid, the incarnation of the Mediator was by a mixture, or confuſion of both natures into one; but then he would be poſſeſſed of neither a divine nor human nature: theſe were called Monophyſites, and Monothelites, aſſerting he had but one nature and one will; though thoſe that deny his divine nature, or his human ſoul, deſerve the ſame titles. Others aſſerted, that the divine was tranſubſtantiated into the human, or that the human was tranſubſtantiated into the divine; or that he took fleſh from the ſubſtance of God, or from heaven, and paſſed only through the Virgin as a conduit. Gelaſius, biſhop of Rome oppoſed, this tranſubſtantiation, by obſerving, that the elements were not tranſubſtantiated into the body and blood of Chriſt, and that there was no more a tranſubſtantiation of the one than the other; the doctrine of tranſubſtantiation was not then known in Rome.

Others ſaid, Chriſt had two perſons, one the Son of God, and the other the Son of Mary, and that Chriſt deſcended on Jeſus as a dove at baptiſm. Others ſaid, Chriſt was God in will only, and that it was not him that was crucified, but a Jew. Others, that it was the devil that was crucified. Others held, that Chriſt's divine nature ſuffered. The names of theſe are to be found in Roſs's Hiſtory of all religions, and in all church hiſtories. Simon Magus, Marcion, Cerdon, Eutyches, Priſcilian, Neſtorius, Manes, Praxeas, &c. were ſome of the chief heretics. Simon Magus not only ſaid that he was the great Power of God, but that he was the Father in Samaria, the Son in Judea, and the Spirit in other nations. Menander ſaid, that Chriſt had only the appearance of humanity, therefore his ſect were called Phantaſtics. Samoſatenus, for denying the divinity of Chriſt, was called Semiſatanus. Photinus held, that Chriſt's divinity was only a divine power. Macedonius held, that the Holy Ghoſt was only a created Spirit; ſome held, that Chriſt was created by the Father, and the Spirit by Chriſt; and that he is only a power or virtue, &c. Apolinarius, who held that the divine nature was converted into fleſh, or that it was inſtead of a rational ſoul to the human, was condemned by the 2d general council, held at Conſtantinople 381. Neſtorius, who held that Jeſus and Chriſt were two perſons, and that the word was in Chriſt only as the Spirit was in the prophets, was condemned by the 3d council, held at Epheſus 430. Eutyches, who held that the fleſh o

Chriſt was turned divine, or converted into the ſubſtance of the word, was condemned by the 4th general council, met at Chalcedon 449.

The Son is inferior to the Father in the ſame ſame reſpect that he is a Son and Mediator, and poſſeſſed of the human nature, and particularly in his ſtate of humiliation; he is called his only Son, as he is the Son of his nature, or poſſeſſed of the ſame nature; the term only begotten is figurative, and applied to his reſurrection from the dead, Acts xiii. 33. Angels and men are alſo ſons by creation, and believers by adoption, and ſaid to be begotten again by their renovation; called therefore regeneration, or a new birth, 1 John v. 18. As the ſecond perſon became the Son, ſo he became ſubject to the Father, and ſent by him; and in the ſame economical relation the third perſon is ſent by the Father and the Son, or proceedeth from both, contrary to the doctrine of the Greek church; John iii. 17. xiv. 26. xv. 26. See Stephen's Viſitation Sermon preached at Plymouth before the biſhop and his clergy, in which he ſhews, that all the other ſchemes of the Trinity are more inconſiſtent than the Athanaſian, &c. Swift's Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity, conſiſtent, in a ſermon on it; Alſop's Anti-ſozzo, and a ſhort defence of the divinity of Chriſt from the ſcriptures; and Dr Perſon on the Creed, &c.

There were other hereſies of leſs note in the apoſtles days, and in the primitive ages, which might perhaps be more irkſome than uſeful to enumerate; however, during that age and the two following, the church was much in the fur-

nace of perſecution, which no doubt kept it more pure and free of corruptions of all kinds than afterwards, when it was ſupported and enriched by the civil power.

The three firſt centuries only can belong to the primitive church; wherein the native purity, and primitive ſimplicity of genuine Chriſtianity in a great meaſure remained, eſpecially in worſhip. And during that time, even in the ſecond century, corruption began in church government; the fiery trial, or furnace of perſecution could not purge out ambition and pride; even while ſuffering perſecution from external enemies, they uſurped over one another, and had ſtrife and contention among them. Prelacy began in the ſecond century, in the manner we will ſee afterwards, when treating of reformation times, which at length grew up to the monſtrous exorbitant height of Popery.

Before we proceed to conſider the corruptions of Popery, we ſhall take a curſory view of the preceding periods, in order to take notice of the riſe of ſome of theſe corruptions that were afterwards eſtabliſhed and canonized by the church of Rome; and we ſhall alſo take notice of ſome hereſies that were not admitted by the church of Rome, ſome of which were adopted by ſome who pretend to be Proteſtants, or members of the reformed church.

Having already taken notice of the principal errors of the firſt century, we proceed to the 2d century. Marcion forbade marriage, and the uſe of wine to his followers; for which they u-

ſed water in the ſacrament, hence called Aquarii; he uſed great mortifications, but yet had many followers. Hermogenes held, that Chriſt's body is in the ſun ſince his reſurrection. Tatian held, that both ſouls and bodies die and riſe again; ſome held, that the ſoul ſleeps till the reſurrection, or is not conſcious of its exiſtence; both theſe heretic's notions will be refuted afterwards. Praxeas held, that God is the Father in heaven, the Son on earth, and the Spirit in believers, this was refuted before. Montanus was a perfect viſionary and enthuſiaſt, pretending to revelations, and that the ſpirit of inſpiration was ſtill in the church, like the Quakers. He had many wild notions from the Pagan mythology, and the cabbala or myſtic-theology of the Jews; a heated imagination, the vanity of being ſingular, and the head of a party, and getting a name, bred heretics. A hot difference aroſe between the eaſtern and weſtern church about the celebration of Eaſter, the firſt were for the paſſover day, and the ſecond, for the Sabbath after it. Barchochab perſuaded the Jews of Paleſtine that he was the Meſſiah; but he turned out to be Barchozbah the ſon of a lie, and not Barchochab the ſon of a ſtar; he called himſelf ſo, alluding to Num. xxiv. 17.

3*d* Century. Clerical celibacy was propoſed and venerated, or to have female companions for Platonic love. Excorciſms were uſed before baptiſm, to free the ſubjects of it from the power of evil ſpirits; and the ſupper was given to infants, private confeſſion was added to the public. Four degrees of penance were uſed in church-diſci-

pline; 1*ſt*, To abide without the church door out of hearing for a time. 2*dly*. To be allowed to hear the word. 3*dly*, To be admitted to prayer. 4*thly*, To the ſacrament and full communion. Manes, a Perſian magian, before he turned Chriſtian, held, that there are two original principles; the firſt, pure light, or God; the ſecond, dark matter with a ſoul, the cauſe of all evil. He held, that there are two ſpirits from God inferior to Chriſt, one in the ſun and another in the moon, and the Holy Spirit's manſion was in the air. The æons, pure ſpirits, together with God, made the kingdom of light; there was a difference between it and that of darkneſs, and thence a mixture, from which aroſe the viſible world. He ſaid, he was inſpired, and an apoſtle of Chriſt, and had been in heaven. He rejected the Old Teſtament: he allowed that God ſent his Son to redeem man, as he was perfectly miſerable, his body being of the mixture. Sabellius held, that the Father, Son, and Spirit, are not three Perſons, but three titles of the ſame Perſon. The Novatians held, that there was no repentance or remiſſion for ſins after baptiſm, that is, of ſuch as were baptized when adults, and for ever excluded ſuch from the church. Hermetic and Monkiſh orders took place. Cyprian, biſhop of Carthage, wrote the biſhop of Rome, None of our biſhops calls himſelf a biſhop of biſhops. There was no prelacy then at Carthage.

4*th* Century. New orders, as ſub-deacons, acolythes, excorciſts, door-keepers, &c. took place; as the Roman Emperor, Conſtantine the

Great, and with him the civil powers, became Chriſtian, the church government was modelled according to that of the empire. Hence, patriarchs, metropolitans, exarchs, primates, archbiſhops, archprieſts, archdeacons, &c. and many Pagan ceremonies introduced in worſhip. (See Middleton's Agreement of Popery and Paganiſm.) Baptiſm was adminiſtered only at Eaſter and Whitſuntide; and afterwards ſome baptized the dead, or others were baptized for them. The word maſs was introduced, and holy days added. Pictures of the ſaints, &c. were uſed in churches for ornament, and as memorials, and afterwards images were introduced, as they laſted better. Arius aroſe in this century, as was before obſerved; and Appolinarius, who held but one nature in Chriſt, that the fleſh was turned divine; hence the monophyſites and monothelites. Macedonius held the Holy Spirit was a creature. The Meſſalians rejected poſitive inſtitutions, as ſacraments, faſts, &c. yea, and all external ordinances, and betook themſelves to deſarts for prayer alone. Heretics firſt put to death. The Donatiſts, like the Papiſts, held, that their church was the only pure ſpotleſs one; and that it was no church that was not in communion with them, and thus confined the church to Africa; this ſchiſm laſted 100 years. Lucifer, biſhop in Sardinia, was a furious bigot; his diſciples were called Luciferians after him. John Chriſoſtom was baniſhed for his piety, and oppoſing vice. External pomp increaſed, and internal purity decreaſed. Images, relics, and veneration to the memory of ſaints took place. Several Emperors

after Conſtantine were Pagan; and Julian was an apoſtate from Chriſtianity, who tried to build Jeruſalem for the Jews, (though himſelf turned Pagan) but was ſtopped by fire from heaven.

5th Century. The empire was divided into two. The Goths, Vandals, Franks, Swevi, Heruli, Burgundians, Lombards, Anglo-Saxons, &c. over-run the weſtern empire; hence the decay of religion and piety; the degeneracy and ambition of the clergy increaſed. The biſhops under Conſtantine had got civil titles, which thoſe of Rome and England yet retain. Four patriarchs took place, viz. of Rome, Conſtantinople, Antioch, and Jeruſalem. Cloiſters for men and women took place; and now they became a ſeminary to prepare church-men, and their head was called Abbot, or father, whom they obeyed as their ſuperior, and vowed not to return to the world. Private confeſſion was encouraged. Pomp and ceremonies increaſed. Leo, Biſhop of Rome, turned public confeſſion of great ſins to private confeſſion to a Prieſt. The worſhip of the Virgin, and adoration of other ſaints, chiefly martyrs, pilgrimages, croſſes, relics, images, we much in vogue. Tapers were uſed in churches in the day time, and incenſe burnt from pompous dedications, and ornaments, were uſed. Apocryphal books were joined to the canon: the doctrine of abſolution took place: the doctrine of the neceſſity of the ſacraments, and particularly of baptiſm, gave riſe to *Limbus Infantum*. Pelagius, a Briton, aſſerted free-will, denied original ſin, inherent and imputed; ſo that there is no need of grace for converſion, as man poſſeſſed

of free-will can convert himſelf; and yet he held baptiſm abſolutely neceſſary, and ſent unbaptized children I know not where, ſo inconſiſtent was he. The Semipelagians aſcribed converſion partly to free-will, and partly to grace. Neſtorius held, that the Virgin was Theotokos, the mother of God, that is, of Chriſt's divine nature. The third general council, held at Epheſus 431, condemned this hereſy of the Theophyſites. Eutyches held, that there is but one nature in Chriſt, that is, a blended mix'd one. The fourth council at Chalcedon, 451, condemned this hereſy of the Monophyſites.

6th Century. The biſhops of Rome pretended openly to an inconteſtible, even a divine right, as ſucceſſor of Peter, to Popiſh univerſal ſupremacy. The order of Benedictine monks, Pope Gregory's canon of the miſſal, the feaſt of the conception and purification of the Virgin, the feaſt of the Baptiſt and Hoſanna, took place.

7th Century. In the beginning of this century the biſhops of Rome, by means of the uſurper, parricide, and tyrant Phocas, whom he helped to obtain the empire, got the ſole title of Pope, or univerſal Biſhop, and aſſumed a ſupreme authority over the church, as Peter's ſucceſſor, and Chriſt's vicegerent and vicar on earth. This gave occaſion to the total and final diviſion of the eaſtern and weſtern, or Greek and Latin churches, as the Greek church would never admit the ſuperiority and authority of the biſhop of Rome, or be ſubject to him; and this afterwards was a mean of the ruin of the Greek empire, as the weſtern one would not aid it againſt

the irruptions of the Turks, unleſs it would ſubmit to the Pope's authority, and the articles of the church of Rome. The hereſies mentioned after the diſcuſſion of the Anti-trinitarian, &c. have either been already refuted, or are evident abſurdities, or will occur to be refuted again with Popery, which adopted and eſtabliſhed them, with the addition of more. We ſhall go on to take notice of ſome more of theſe, in order to ſee in what periods ſome other errors aroſe that were afterwards conſecrated by Popery. The feaſt of the Virgin's birth was fixed to September 8th. The elevation of the croſs took place, 631, pretended to have been found by Helena, the mother of Conſtantine the Great. And before that time, viz. in 610, Pope Boniface IVth conſecrated November 1ſt to the memory of all ſaints. Rites increaſed more than I can detain to enumerate. The monks, who greatly increaſed in the weſt, contributed much to the corruption of the faith: they were the firſt that introduced purgatory, and pretended viſions and revelations for it. Eutychianiſm, &c. prevailed in this century; and Monotheliſm, one will, and one operation of it, divine and human. Theandriken, Theodorus introduced it, and favoured the doctrine of the Monophyſytes. The ſixth general council at Conſtantinople condemned it.

8*th* Century. The Popes aroſe to a high degree of power; they got temporal poſſeſſions, vied with kings, and looſed ſubjects from their allegeance. Private maſſes began to be uſed. There was a war of the Iconoclaſts with the Iconolators. The council of Conſtance con-

lemned the latter in 754; and ſaid Chriſt left no other image of himſelf in the church but the ſacrament; others ſaid, that it was not the image but the real body of Chriſt. Images gave riſe to this notion, and pictures were the foundation of images, and image-worſhip thus aroſe.

9*th* Century. Paſchas Radbert, a monk of Corbia, laid the firſt foundation of tranſubſtantiation. Bertram, or Ratram, oppoſed it. The Greek church condemned the Latin one about the deſcent of the Spirit from the Son, as implying a Hyiopatria, and there was a total ſeparation. They differed alſo in other articles, as, 1*dly*, The faſt of the Sabbath uſed at Rome. 2*dly*, The duration of the faſt in Lent. 4*thly*, The ſhaving the beards of the Latin prieſts. 5*thly*, The law of celibacy. 6*thly*, The unction of chriſm in the forehead in baptiſm. 7*thly*, The admiſſion of deacons to the Epiſcopacy. 8*thly*, The uſe of common water inſtead of chriſm. 9*thly*, The conſecrated lamb at the feaſt of Eaſter. 10*thly*, The pre-eminence of the church of Rome. The trials of thoſe whoſe crimes could not be found, by hot iron and cold water, &c. Cruelties were uſed.

10*th* Century. The conſent and confirmation of the Emperor was yet held neceſſary to the election of Popes. Groſs corruptions took place among the clergy and in cloiſters. Canonizing of ſaints began; the Popes claimed it as their exclusive privilege. They were continually adding to the number of the ſaints, and the worſhip paid them. Man's own merits were chiefly

conſidered as the cauſe of juſtification. Anthropomorphiſm, that is, repreſenting God in a human ſhape, which began in the 4th century, was openly profeſſed by ſome now. This groſs corporeal idea aroſe from images and the want of true philoſophy. Thus the Sabean Pagans thought their religious worſhip would be vain if they did not ſee the object of it; they would rather worſhip ſtocks and ſtones than an inviſible Deity: but the Magians had a contrary opinion, that God could not be ſeen with bodily eyes; many retained this opinion, and all had it at firſt. The deepeſt ignorance and groſſeſt corruption in morals took place in this century, therefore called the obſcure and wretched century of iron and lead: there was no diſcipline; all light was under a buſhel, and all decency trodden under foot in this deplorable century. Feaſts, pilgrimages, images, relicks, were the chief foundation of their religion. The baptizing of bells was inſtituted by Pope John XIII.

11th Century. The notions of viſiting the holy places in Paleſtine, as Chriſt's ſepulchre, &c. aroſe, and therefore, to take it from the Saracens, they took the croſs with them; hence theſe adventures were called Cruſades. The Popes openly proclaimed war, and preſcribed laws to the Emperors. There were great contentions at the electing of Popes between them and the Antipopes, that is, Antagoniſts, and there were three Popes at a time. Gregory VIIth made laws concerning clerical celibacy. The new dignity of Cardinals was introduced; it was given to their principal prieſts and dea-

cons, and now decreed, that Popes be elected by them, and that their council conſiſt of them. The higheſt dignity was thus conferred on them next to the pope, ſo they became ſuperior to biſhops and archbiſhops. The popes claimed the right of inveſtiture, that is, of conferring benefices and church-lands, (which belonged to the Emperor, as he originally gave it,) and engaged alledgeance. The feaſt of all ſouls was inſtituted, and the Sabbath of the Virgin. The cuſtom of repeating a certain number of prayers, and counting them by the help of the beads of a chaplet, which was uſed from the fifth century with fanatic monks, became now general. It was introduced by Peter the Hermit, who was the beginning of the holy wars. Taking money for penance was now introduced. The Gregorian miſſal was now extended to Spain: the king of it kept longer free of the pope's influence than the king of France. Alexander II. and Gregory VII. ordered divine ſervice in all churches to be performed in no other languages but the Greek or Latin: thus the Sclavonic was baniſhed from all places where it was uſed. Tranſubſtantiation, broached in the ninth century, got now many adherents, and alſo purgatory. Roſcelin in France held, that the Trinity are as three ſouls, or three angels, with one will and power. He was condemned by the council of Soiſons. Others ran to the oppoſite extreme of Sabellianiſm, which is more conſiſtent than Socinianiſm. The diſſention between the Greek and Latin churches ſtill increaſed. The firſt condemned in the latter four points, *1ſt*,

The uſing unleavened bread in the ſacrament. 2*dly*, Saturday's faſt in Lent. 3*dly*, Uſing blood, and things ſtrangled. 4*thly*, Singing hallelujah in Lent. The patriarch of Conſtantinople and the pope excommunicated one another, and hence all hope of union was gone. Pope Syl. veſter II. made a law, that none ſhould impriſon a biſhop under pain of being torn by wild beaſts. All eccleſiaſtics were condemned, as keeping wenches, that had wives; and inveſtiture by laics was counted ſimony. The pope depoſed the Emperor of Germany; he aſſumed the ſole right of calling councils, creating new laws, inveſting princes and the clergy: that no work is canonical that bears not his authority; that none can change or diſannul his ſentence but himſelf, nor be his judge; that all princes ſhould kiſs his feet; that the Roman church never did err, and never can err; that the pope becomes holy by the merits of Peter, being his ſucceſſor, and Chriſt's vicar: that whoever differs from the Roman church is not a Catholic. Celibacy was ſtill more and more urged. Many eccleſiaſtics of Milan, rather than ſeparate from their wives, ſeparated from the communion of the church of Rome, and formed ſeparate aſſemblies in a place called Paterin; hence the origin of the Paterins and Vaudois, well known in the following century. Reformation began in this.

12*th* Century. An order of monks aroſe in Paleſtine that called themſelves Carmelites, from mount Carmel, in 1170.

Zigabenus publiſhed an excellent book againſt hereſy, called the Panoply of Orthodoxy. A

philoſophy prevailed, that enlivened the wit, but did not ſtrengthen the judgment; logical ſubtilties, ſcholaſtic theology, and philoſophy founded on Ariſtotle's philoſophy, barbarous expreſſions, bombaſt myſtic theology, &c. abſurdities took place; the number of the ſacraments increaſed; many ſeparated from the communion of Rome, for groſs errors, and formed parties. The Vadois were the moſt famous, from Peter Valdo of Lyons, who in 1140 tranſlated the ſcripture, and taught purer doctrine. See their confeſſion of faith. Theſe of Piedmont were prior to the 12th century. The Albigenſes, from Albi, a town in Guienne, were now charged as heretics, for teaching purer doctrine than the church of Rome. They were called alſo Bruſians, from Peter and Henry Bruys their teachers. Peter was condemned to be burnt, and alſo many of their people; but being numerous, they were formidable in ſeveral countries. A ſchiſm with the antipopes was ſupported by the Emperor 18 years.

Cruſades againſt the infidels being over, the council of Lateran, held by Pope Alexander III. appointed others againſt the heretics; indulgencies were promiſed to all that would engage in this war, and excommunication was denounced on all that ſuffered heretics on their eſtates, or kept any ſociety with them.

13*th* Century. The King of France differed with the Pope, he looſed the ſubjects from their allegiance to the King, and laid the kingdom under an interdict, and all divine worſhip was prohibited.

Viſiting the holy ſepulchre procured remiſſion of all ſins.

The Dominican and Franciſcan orders were founded in this century, ſo called from their founders; the firſt alſo erected the dreadful tribunal of the inquiſition, which was approved by Pope Innocent, in the 4th council of Lateran 1215, in which tranſubſtantiation was confirmed. This doctrine gave riſe to the elevation and adoration of the conſecrated hoſt, and the care of preſerving it after the celebration of the maſs; and they began to deprive the laity of the cup. Pope Urban IV. inſtituted the feaſt of the body of Chriſt, pretending revelations for it. The idolatrous worſhip of the Mother, and the roſary of the Virgin and her pſalter, were current. The orders of Mendicants and Auguſtines aroſe in this century; about the end of this century Boniface VIII. celebrated the firſt jubilee of the Chriſtian church; an invention to fill his treaſures by the ſale of indulgencies. Joachim, an abbot of Calabria, ſaid the Pope was Antichriſt, which was a crime his holineſs could not pardon. There was a violent perſecution of the Vadois and Albigenſes. A ſect called Apoſtolics aroſe, and condemned the pride, opulence, tyranny, &c. of the Pope and the clergy; propoſing to reſtore the primitive ſimplicity, temperance, &c. in food, dreſs, houſes, &c. of Chriſt and his apoſtles; they held, that true Chriſtianity conſiſted in having no proper poſſeſſions but in a community of goods; they applied to the Pope and the church of Rome, the

titles of Antichriſt, and the Great Whore of Babylon. They were ſcattered by perſecution.

14*th* Century. Pope Boniface VIII. appeared the one day in prieſt's robes, and the other in ſtate robes, and ſaid, *ecce duo gladii hic*, Here are two ſwords, having a drawn ſword by him; the pompous proceſſions were in ſcarlet; he declared every human creature ſhould be ſubject to the Pope; that it was neceſſary to ſalvation to be ſo. Benedict II. and Clement V. reverſed the acts of Boniface, againſt Philip King of France, who was excommunicated by Boniface. There was a ſchiſm of 50 years continuance between the parties of Italy and France, about electing Popes of their reſpective countries. The Quietiſts aroſe, who ſaid, that by having their eyes fixed on their navel, while they brought their ſouls to a ſtate of repoſe, that they ſaw the uncreated divine light of God with their eyes.

Wickliff aroſe in England, whoſe doctrines, like theſe of the Vadois and Albigenſes, ſpread over ſeveral countries; he firſt tranſlated the Bible into Engliſh; he held, that Rome was Antichriſt; he oppoſed the idolatrous worſhip of ſaints, and images, indulgencies, clerical celibacy, auricular confeſſion, tranſubſtantiation, &c.; his followers are ſaid to be called Lollards, from a German of that name, or rather from a word that ſignifies chanters, or pſalm-ſingers. The jubilee, that was celebrated at firſt but once in a century, was now ordered to be once in fifty years.

15*th* Century. A general deſire of reforma-

tion was expreſſed by the cry both of the people and the fathers, in all the councils held in this century; the Roman writers cannot deny, that the neceſſity of it was acknowledged, both in the head and the members, in faith and manners; ſee the acts of the council of Conſtance; but the Pope hindered it, leſt his avarice ſhould ſuffer by it. John Huſs aroſe about 100 years after Wickliff, and about 100 before Luther, and alſo oppoſed the Roman corruptions his doctrines ſpread through Bohemia, &c. and had many abettors, as Jerom of Prague, &c. and though they had promiſed he ſhould have a ſafe journey to the council of Conſtance, yet the faith was violated, and he was burnt. Like the Vadois and Wickliffites, they were for the ſacrament in both kinds. The cup was indulged to the Bohemians for peace, they were therefore called Calixtines. Pope Martine V. promiſed to call a council for reformation. In 1453, the Greek empire, and Conſtantinople the royal city, was conquered by the Turks. Jerom of Ferrara, called Rome Babylon; all was ſold at it; indulgences, abſolutions, altars, temples, ſacraments, &c.; the diſſenters, like thoſe in France after the reformation, took arms.

16*th* Century. Pope Leo X. ſold indulgences from the pains of Purgatory, and for all ſins paſt, preſent, and future; things were more ſcandalous than ever before. All the acts of the council of Piſa in 1511, which forbad obedience to Pope Julius II. were condemned.

Martin Luther, doctor of divinity, who had during a ſickneſs an old prieſt with him, who

inſtructed him in the doctrine of the New Teſtament, oppoſed Tetzel, the Pope's Legate, in ſelling indulgences, and began the reformation in 1517.

We come now to conſider the moſt remarkable event, next to the propagation of the goſpel, and the planting of the Chriſtian church, viz. the reformation and renovation of it; whereby the morning light ſprung from a long and darkſome night, which was like a reſurrection from the dead.

We have given ſome ſketches of the riſe, progreſs, and increaſe of corruption in every age, which gave occaſion to a reformation, and rendered it neceſſary. The enemy began to ſow the tares of hereſy, ſchiſm, libertiniſm, &c. corruptions, even in the Apoſtolic age. The 2d and 3d centuries gave birth to prelacy, though for want of the means of growth, and nouriſhment to ſupport it, it remained in its infant ſtate. The three firſt ages had more genuine ſimplicity, and native purity. The three following were more corrupt in doctrine by error, in worſhip by ſuperſtition, and in church government by aſpiring ambition, affecting pre-eminence and ſuperiority, which increaſed till (*paſtorum faſtus peperit Papam, alias Anti-chriſtum*, 2 Theſ. ii. 3, 4.) pride produced the Pope. Corruption may be ſaid now to have got the dominion, and to go on victoriouſly, making eaſy and rapid progreſs. Darkneſs increaſed, during the three following centuries, to a dreadful degree, when the reign of groſs darkneſs took place, which continued

for three centuries more; viz. till the 13th century; from which time to the reformation, tho' gloomy, and almoſt total darkneſs reigned in the weſt, yet ſome beams of light from time to time darted amidſt the gloomy darkneſs, which uſhered in the day of reformation.

In the Chriſtian church there were now three grand diviſions, viz. the Greek, the Roman, and the Reformed. We ſhall firſt conſider wherein they all agree; ſecondly, wherein they differ; thirdly, point out and refute abſurdities.

Theſe three churches, or three parts of the whole Chriſtian church, agree in the general principles of Chriſtianity, in doctrine, worſhip, and morality. The chief difference lies in additions, not known to the apoſtles and the primitive church, as will be obſerved afterwards; for they all agree in the twelve articles of the creed, called the Apoſtolic creed, as being the ſummary of the apoſtles doctrine; though it was compiled in the ſecond century. They all agree in the doctrine of the Trinity, ſome few individuals in each excepted; and conſequently, they agree to the other creeds made in defence of it; and therefore they agree as to the ſupreme object of worſhip, the offices of the Mediator, and the ſanctification of the Spirit. They all agree as to the law of God, and the duties of piety, ſobriety, and morality; though not in the motives, means, and ends, for doing them. They all admit baptiſm and the Lord's ſupper; and the firſt day of the week for the Chriſtian Sabbath, and the Lord's prayer as the pattern of prayer, &c.

In the Greek church, antecedent to the reformation, we ſhall include all but the Roman; it was ſo called, becauſe it ſpoke the Greek language, and the Roman or Latin church was ſo called, becauſe it ſpoke the Roman or Latin language; though all the bounds of either did not ſpeak theſe languages, but only the more conſiderable parts. Antient Greece conſiſted of the Grecian ſtates in the Peloponeſus in Europe, and in the Leſſer Aſia, &c.; but after the conqueſts of Alexander the Great, the Greek literature was introduced into thoſe nations that belonged to the Greek empire, and were ſubject to his ſucceſſors; and antient Greece retained its language, when conquered by the Romans, and ſubject to them. And therefore in the Roman church we do not include all that became ſubject to the Roman empire, but only what was called the Weſtern empire, after the Roman empire was divided into two. Theſe empires alſo ceaſed to have the Greek and Roman languages, for their vernacular languages, after they were conquered by other nations, that introduced their own languages, or formed a mixt language, by the mixture of inhabitants, conſiſting of their old and new maſters. Though the liturgies, or religious ſervices of theſe churches, were ordered by the Pope to be retained and performed in their old languages. We ought alſo to diſtinguiſh between theſe parts in the Greek church that were conquered by the Turks, Saracens, Moors, Tartars, &c. as Conſtantinople, the very ſeat of the eaſtern empire, antient Greece and Aſia were; and thoſe that enjoy civil and religi-

ous liberty, and the means of knowledge, as ſeminaries of learning; the former being deprived of religious liberty, ſunk into deep ignorance, or degenerated into groſs corruption.

The Greek church agrees in moſt things with either the Roman or reformed; wherein it differs from the one, it agrees with the other. A great many of the corruptions of the church of Rome aroſe before the ſchiſm between it and the Greek church; many of which aroſe in the eaſt, and theſe continued in both churches after the diviſion; ſo that the Greek church has a great many of the groſs corruptions of the Latin church; but Pictet, &c. obſerve, that it is not wholly ſo corrupt, in either doctrine, or worſhip, or church-government; though it is ſunk into deplorable ignorance, and ſuperſtition; it agrees with the reformed church, in diſowning the Pope, purgatory, images, clerical celibacy, and in adminiſtrating the ſacrament in both kinds.

The Greek church holds the ſcriptures the ſupreme rule, and the fathers and councils ſubordinate; they reject abſolutions, indulgences, the ſacrifice of the maſs, adoration, and proceſſion of elements, the Popiſh five ſacraments, &c.; in all which it differs from the Roman church; but it differs from the reformed church, in uſing pictures, and though they reject purgatory, they have ſomething reſembling it. Like the Mahometans, they hold, that the Holy Ghoſt proceeds only from the Father, and not from the Son; they eat no blood, and ſome Greeks obſerve both Sabbaths; they uſe the croſs to drive

away evil ſpirits, &c.; they hold that pictures of angels and ſaints may be reverenced, that they are interceſſors for us, and have days dedicated to them; that baptiſm is eſſential to ſalvation; that ſouls go not to heaven till the reſurrection; they keep feſtivals, as Eaſter, Lent, &c.

But we ſhall proceed to conſider ſome of the principal differences between the Roman and reformed churches. So numerous are the corruptions of the Roman church, many of which are alſo ſo ridiculous, that we cannot detain to enumerate them all, as they are almoſt paſt reckoning up; we will only point out the principal ones, as it will be ſufficient for ſupporting the cauſe of the reformed church; if we point out as many, and as great corruptions as were a ſufficient cauſe for ſeparation, ſince there was no remaining in the communion of that church, without full conformity; as they were abſolutely impoſed, and that as fundamental articles of faith, or eſſential to worſhip and church government, and a great many that belong not directly to either of theſe. As we intend to give a general and pretty full account of popiſh corruptions, and not to omit any of importance, we ſhall proceed methodically, by taking them in claſſes. We begin with conſidering their marks of a true church. The four following are the principal:

1ſt, The church of Rome claims antiquity as a mark of the true church belonging to her, viz. that ſhe is the firſt, or moſt ancient church, from whence the goſpel went forth, and by whoſe

ambaſſadors, or miſſionaries, all the world was converted to Chriſtianity. This is a very confident falſehood, for Rome is not the moſt ancient, or mother-church. The doctrine of the goſpel did not proceed from Rome, nor was propagated by miſſionaries from it, but from Jeruſalem, according to the prophecy, Iſaiah ii. 3. and the commiſſion given by Chriſt, Luke xxiv. 47. Acts i. 8.; and much more by Paul than by Peter, 1 Cor. xv. 10. The firſt was the great apoſtle of the Gentiles; and the Romans, being Gentiles, had the prior title to his chair, or to claim him as theirs, as he wrote them an epiſtle, and was at Rome: and Jeruſalem has the prior title to Peter's chair, and to be the primate's ſee, as ſhe was the mother-church, if Peter had any prerogative, which he has not. Peter never aſſumed any ſuperiority, but Paul aſſumed an authority over him, Gal. ii. 11.—The church of Jeruſalem and the Greek church in Aſia, Africa, and Europe, as Antioch, Alexandria, Athens, Conſtantinople, Corinth, Epheſus, &c, have a better claim to antiquity than the Roman or Latin church. There were about ſix or more of the epiſtles written before that to the Romans; for neither the pſalms, prophecies, nor epiſtles, are arranged in the order in which they were written; but that to the Romans is put firſt, being the longeſt, and containing the fundamental doctrine of the goſpel, as it's principal topic, being the proper ſeat of it: and the Roman church made a ſchiſm from the Greek church, which never allowed the biſhop of Rome's uſurped ſupremacy.

Therefore the church of Rome has no right to claim the title of Catholic, or Univerſal, which is the ſecond prerogative ſhe claims; for tho' ſhe was once poſſeſſed of the Proteſtant churches, and exerciſed her dominion over them before the reformation, yet ſhe never had any dominion or ſuperiority over the Greek church: and this leads us to conſider that queſtion which ſhe thinks unanſwerable, Where was your church, or your religion, before Luther?

It is granted, that God always had a church on earth, more or leſs viſible, though it was ſometimes very ſmall, and at other times very obſcure. (A church is a religious ſociety, formed for the worſhip of God, and fellowſhip with one another in the exerciſes of religion.)

In paradiſe it conſiſted only of two perſons, which are the feweſt that can form a ſociety.

In the ark it conſiſted but of eight.—When Abraham was called it had almoſt diſappeared. It conſiſted afterwards of his family, and in the families of the ſucceeding patriarchs.

In the New Teſtament-times it conſiſted at firſt of Chriſt's family, viz. the twelve apoſtles, and the ſeventy diſciples that were added to them; and in after times it was often much oppreſſed by perſecution, (and obliged to ſculk and hide) or obſcured by corruption down to the reformation. But to come to the countries where the Proteſtant and reformed, or, in other words, the Chriſtian church is, we anſwer, It was there before Luther. A remnant was preſerved ſtill amidſt the corruption, Rom. ix. 27. xi. 5. Rev. iii. 4. though often much oppreſſed,

and ſcattered, and obſcured. It ſhone forth, however, in the Vadois, or Waldenſes, Albigenſes, Wickliffites, Lollards, Huſſites, Culdees, &c. &c. and it is yet in France as it was before the reformation; for there are many Chriſtian ſocieties or Proteſtants there, tho' much concealed, till of late, as not above ſix might be together at divine ſervice.

But the true anſwer is this; The church of Rome has all the eſſentials and ſcripture-inſtitutions which Proteſtants admit only, but ſhe adds others to them. She owns the true Mediator, and ſacraments, *&c.* but adds others to them; now the queſtion and anſwer to it are exactly parallel to the following: One who had never ſeen a miner before ſaw one come out of a coal-mine, with his face all beſmeared and black, ſo that he ſeemed to be a negro; the ſame man having waſhed and cleanſed his face, recovered his original white complexion. The ſtranger aſked him, Where was your complexion before? he anſwered, It was where it is yet, and I have only waſhed off the dirt that covered and beſmeared it. So Proteſtants have only wiped off the pollutions of popery, and retain the eſſentials of Chriſtianity, as before.

3*dly*, A third prerogative the church of Rome claims, as a mark of the true church belonging to her, is unity. Whatever degree of unity the church of Rome has, ſhe has no cauſe to boaſt of it, as it has been maintained by the moſt antichriſtian means, viz. perſecution, fire, and ſword, *&c.* and, in a word, by the civil, or worldly power, and not by ſpiritual means, and

the divine influence: and this is not the unity of the Spirit in the bond of Chriſtian peace and brotherly love, being only by conſtraint and force of arms, and not with Chriſtian liberty. Nor is ſhe poſſeſſed of that unity ſhe boaſts of, for ſhe has had great contentions and diviſions, as of popes with antipopes, ſeveral at a time, each ſupported by a party. There was once a ſchiſmatic contention that laſted 50 years, and another 28; and the different orders, as the Dominicans, Franciſcans, *&c.* had violent contentions and differences. See Stillingfleet's Idolatry of the church of Rome.

4thly, A fourth privilege the church of Rome claims, as a mark of the true church belonging to her, is infallibility, that ſhe cannot err, which I refute thus: That which is infallible muſt be unchangeable, for if it changed, it muſt have been wrong either before or after the change; therefore we have only to examine if the church of Rome has undergone any changes; but it is evident to the world how many changes ſhe has undergone, both in doctrine, as articles of faith, and in modes of worſhip, and in multiplying the inferior objects of it, and in church-government, by the addition of new orders of the ſubjects of it: one pope and one council condemned what another decreed, *&c.* See all eccleſiaſtic hiſtories. But it is argued, that if it be ſo, then the gates of hell have prevailed. Anſwer, The gates of hell may prevail more or leſs, as to perſecute, oppreſs, extirpate, or corrupt, partly, or totally, the doctrine, faith, or worſhip, to divide, or to deſtroy. Errors are either fundamental or

not; the former are meant here. Matth. xxviii. 20. is alſo alledged for this purpoſe. If Chriſt, who is the light and the life, ceaſe to be with the church by his Spirit, ſhe will ceaſe to be really, tho' ſhe may have a formal being. The ſeven churches of Aſia, *&c.* are extinct. But the error, or wilful miſtake of the church of Rome, lyes in making ordinary paſtors and times equal to the apoſtles times and gifts, as infallibility, &c.; and pretending that every age had miracles or prophecy, (ſorceries, divinations, *&c.*) though not conſtantly or always; yet no age was wholly without them: but let them ſhew if they have the gifts of tongues, healing, *&c.*

Having thus conſidered the principal things which the church of Rome claims as peculiar to her, and as marks of the true church, and having ſhewn that they do not belong to her, we proceed to conſider the capital thing in diſpute, which is, the authority of the Pope, or right of ſupremacy, which the biſhop of Rome pretends to, over the whole Chriſtian church, as a viſible head, or Chriſt's vicar and vicegerent on earth, and Peter's ſucceſſor. The hinge on which their argument originally turns here, is Peter's alledged ſupremacy over the reſt of the apoſtles. This, however, cannot be ſhown, but the contrary is evident from ſcripture. The ſcripture they alledge to ſupport this argument is Matth. xvi. 18, 19. Now, if it is evident from ſcripture that the reſt of the apoſtles had this power and privilege in common with Peter, then he had no ſuperiority granted him over the

reſt; but the former is evident from the following texts, in Matth xviii. 18. The key of diſcipline, or the power of binding and looſing, is given to the whole church, which can bear no greater reſtriction than to the church-repreſentative, that is, church-officers, or the teachers and governors of the church. And in John xx. 23. the key of diſcipline, or the power of retaining and forgiving ſins, is given to all the apoſtles. In Rev. xxi. 14. the twelve apoſtles are equally repreſented as the foundations of the church: but though they planted the church, and propagated Chriſtianity, by converting Jews and Gentiles to the profeſſion of the goſpel, and thus brought them into the church, or built it up of them, yet they were but foundations founding, and founded it upon Chriſt, who is mentioned in ſcripture as the prime foundation, Iſa. xxviii. 16. 1 Cor. iii. 11. 1 Pet. ii. 6, 7.; and in Eph. ii. 20. both the prophets and apoſtles are conſidered as foundations; but Chriſt is ſtill the primary one, and the chief corner-ſtone that unites the building. In Matth. xxviii. 16. to the end, the ſame commiſſion, power, and authority, is given to them all.

But the obvious meaning of Matth. xvi. 18, 19. ſeems to be this; This noble confeſſion of thine, that is, the faith thou haſt confeſſed, or, which is the ſame, this perſon thou haſt confeſſed to be the Son of God and promiſed Meſſiah; or this great article of thy faith in him, is the immoveable foundation on which I will build my church, and the power and policy of Satan ſhall not prevail to ſwallow it up. And his ſay-

ing, this rock, is analogous to his ſaying this temple, John ii. 19, 21. which he meant of himſelf. And the apoſtles laid this foundation in preaching the goſpel. A key denotes power and authority; this was the key of knowledge and diſcipline to teach and govern the church. How ſins are remitted by the church, and how ſhe binds and looſes, will be conſidered afterwards. Peter was not firſt in Chriſt, or firſt called, John i. 40. though he is ſometimes firſt named, as being perhaps the oldeſt; and in Gal. ii. 11. we ſee Paul reproves him for his miſconduct, which ſhews at leaſt that he did not acknowledge his ſuperiority, or infallibility. The apoſtles were infallible in doctrine, or in what they taught and wrote by inſpiration, but not in practice, only Chriſt was ſo. That Peter ever was at Rome, and biſhop of it, is not agreed among the learned: but it is ſufficient for our purpoſe, that there is no authority for it from ſcripture; and tho' he had been at it, as he was previouſly at Jeruſalem, Antioch, and Alexandria, they have a prior title to his chair, not to allow it to be removed to Rome.

In ſhort, the church of Rome has quite miſtaken her plan here, for Paul would have ſuited her purpoſe greatly better; his converſion was miraculous, and his labours more extenſive, than all the reſt: he wrote the epiſtle to the Romans, and was at Rome himſelf, and was the apoſtle of the Gentiles, and the greateſt of all the apoſtles; and Peter was the leaſt, as he baſely denied Chriſt.

Thus we have ſhewn, that the biſhop of Rome's

claim to any prerogative, as Peter's ſucceſſor, is vain; we never find Peter claiming this prerogative above the reſt; and if he was firſt named, or choſen preſident, it muſt be on account of his ſeniority. As for the prelacy of the church of Rome, (the higheſt order of which is the cardinalſhip) it will fall under our conſideration when treating of it in the Proteſtant churches.

Their monaſtic orders, mendicants, &c. are too numerous and too abſurd to be conſidered here. Only let it be obſerved, that monks and hermits miſtake the end of coming into the world, which is to promote the good of ſociety, by good offices. They cannot profit God by their piety and devotion, and only profit themſelves, by improving their own minds, or bettering their hearts and diſpoſitions; but this is ſelfiſhneſs, and not ſocial love, Pſal. xvi. 2, 3. And mendicants, who make choice of poverty, entirely miſtake the duties of Chriſtianity and ſociety, as they devote themſelves to idleneſs, and put it out of their power to do good, 2 Theſſ. iii. 10. Acts xx. 35.

The reader muſt ſtill keep the rule in his eye by which we are to proceed, viz. the word of God, from which we have ſhewn, that the biſhop of Rome has no title to be Peter's ſucceſſor, and that Peter had no ſuperiority over the reſt of the apoſtles. There is no judging any thing without a rule of judgment, for where there is no rule or law, their can be no tranſgreſſion.

It naturally occurs then, to aſk the church of Rome, 1*ſt*, What is her religion? 2*dly*, Wherein is

the rule or ſtandard of it contained? As for the firſt, ſhe will anſwer, It is the Chriſtian religion; and, ſecondly, That it is contained in the New Teſtament; then whatever has no foundation in the New Teſtament muſt be a human invention, and an addition of their own, introducing a mixture or corruption into the Chriſtian religion. Being baffled here, they fly to traditions as a ſubterfuge, and ſay, that, beſides the ſcriptures, the traditions of the church are to be regarded as a ſupplementary rule to compleat the ſcriptures; and for this end they alſo add ſome books of the Apocrypha, though the Jewiſh church never acknowledged it as canonical. They alſo hold, that the ſcripture receives its authority from the church; and again, reciprocally, the church receives its authority from the ſcripture; and thus argue in a circle, and involve themſelves in ſtrange inconſiſtencies; as they do alſo about the mutual authority of the ſcripture and traditions, which laſt they ſay Chriſt delivered to his apoſtles, not to be committed to writing, but to be communicated orally, from one to another; but at laſt they wrote them in a book, as the Phariſees did their's; and hence they are never at a loſs to get authority for every thing from tradition that they cannot get from the ſcripture, which they alledge is deficient, and an unſufficient rule without tradition; contrary to which, we prove from the ſcripture itſelf, that it is a perfect rule, without unwritten tradition, 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.; if it were not a perfect rule, it could not make the man of God perfect; and in Col. ii. 8. and Matth.

xv. 9. human traditions are ſeverely condemned. But if we take tradition in its moſt extenſive ſenſe, then it implies every ordinance given to the church, as the ſacraments, and even the ſcriptures themſelves; as tradition ſignifies any thing given or delivered; this is doubtleſs the meaning of it in 2 Theſ. ii. 15. for the things contained in the Epiſtle are called traditions, as well as what the apoſtle taught there by preaching. To the ſame purpoſe is 2 Tim. ii. 2. and the original of 1 Cor. xi. 2.; and indeed it is blaſphemy to impeach the wiſdom or goodneſs of God in alledging that he gave not a perfect and certain rule, if he gave any at all, but left his church to be guided by uncertain tradition.

2*dly*, They pretend the ſcripture is ſo obſcure, that it cannot be underſtood by the unlearned, 2 Pet. iii. 16. Acts viii. 31.; but we aſſert, that all things neceſſary to ſalvation are clear and eaſy to be underſtood by the meaneſt capacity; Hab. ii. 2. God adapted the ſcriptures to the capacity of them for whom they were deſigned. See the fifth rule of interpretation.

The knowledge of the original languages is the beſt human help, as the great Dr Owen obſerves, in his Cauſes, ways, and means of underſtanding the mind of God in his word; and in his Reaſon of faith, that is, the reaſon why we believe the ſcriptures to be the word of God, with a divine faith, or ſee the internal evidence of Revelation aright. He obſerves, that grace, or the ſupernatural aids of the Spirit, that inſpired the ſcriptures, and ſpeaks in them, is a better

help to underſtand the ſpiritual and real ſenſe of them, than human learning is, John vi. 45. Jer. xxxi. 34. 1 John ii. 27.; literal ſcripture has but one ſenſe, as was obſerved in the rule of interpretation. The figurative has two, a near, and a remote; but heretics will wreſt any ſcripture to their deſtruction, to make it ſpeak what it never meant.

Whatever is not expreſsly contained in ſcripture, or by clear conſequence, is not matter of our faith and obedience, and whatever is not plainly ſo, is not a matter of importance to us.

The apoſtles rather publiſhed than interpreted the goſpel, which they received by inſpiration; not that they had no authority to publiſh or write any thing but what is contained in the goſpels, or even what they heard from Chriſt, as Sherlock on Jude 3. aſſerts, as he and other Socinians in fact reject all the New Teſtament but the Goſpels, unleſs it be the Acts, and the Epiſtles of James; the apoſtles knew not even the nature of the goſpel-diſpenſation, and Meſſiah's kingdom, far leſs all the doctrines of it, before the effuſion of the Holy Ghoſt, John xvi. 12, 13. Acts i. 6. they alſo intepreted the Old Teſtament, and found things therein which none could ſee without inſpiration, as the apoſtle diſcovers a ſenſe in Abraham's covenant, and bleſſing which no uninſpired interpreter could have found. The Epiſtles contain the noon-day of the goſpel, of which the goſpels are but the dawning; ſee on the beginning of the Chriſtian religion. The Epiſtles, and eſpecially Paul's, give more trouble to Socinians and Papiſts than

all the reſt of ſcripture; the doctrines of juſtification, Chriſt's divinity and atonement, &c. are clearly taught there, Rom. iii. 24. v. 8. Gal. ii. 16. Iſaiah xlv. 23, 24. compared with Phil. ii. 10. where Jehovah is rendered Jeſus.

The next ſubterfuge of Papiſts to traditions are the dictates of the church, or the decrees of the council of Trent, (for the fathers and their councils fail them,) it was convocated by the Pope's mandate in 1545, and conſiſted of his creatures, and was conducted by his Legate to his mind, it ſat 18 years in that remote place, in Italy; the decrees of it, are the ultimate deciſion in all caſes, but they differ about the explication of them. Moſt of their innovations were but matters of opinion before, which were then eſtabliſhed as articles of faith. We have ſeen when, and by whom ſeveral of them had their original; but many of them are of an obſcure original, and were privily and gradually introduced; ſo that the authors of them, and their commencement, are not on record, as is the caſe with many of the liberal and mechanical arts, and other diſcoveries.

The church of Rome indeed was obliged to make a kind of reformation, of ſome groſs abſurdities, that could not abide the light of the reformation from Popery, but others they ſtill retained.

As not allowing the ſcriptures to be tranſlated into the language of the people, and thus denying them the uſe of them, and uſing the liturgy, or ſervice of the church, in an unknown tongue; now this is ſo palpable an abſurdity,

that it needs no refutation, as it is contrary to the common ſenſe of mankind to ſpeak in an unknown tongue; one is not inſtructed by what he does not underſtand; it is alſo contrary to expreſs ſcripture precepts, Col. iv. 16. 1 Theſ. v. 27. 1 Cor. xiv. Acts xvii. 11. John v. 39.

Their argument, that the unlearned would abuſe the ſcripture to their hurt, if they had the uſe of it, has the ſame weight againſt the liberty of uſing any other thing; many abuſe meat and drink to gluttony and drunkenneſs, and their eyes to covetouſneſs, voluptuouſneſs, and ambition.

Not allowing the church the uſe of ſcripture, is like taking the ſun out of the heavens; but the reaſon they do it is, that the people may not have light to ſee their abſurdities, but be kept in darkneſs and ignorance, and yield implicit faith and obedience to fallible and corrupt men, who deceive them, to make merchandiſe of them.

1ſt, The doctrine of juſtification and grace is dangerouſly corrupted in the church of Rome; and next to the perſon, offices, &c. of the Mediator, this is the principal doctrine of the goſpel. It was what the apoſtle chiefly contended for in the Epiſtles to the Romans and Galatians; and Luther calls it the article on which the church ſtands or falls, that is, according as it is preſerved or corrupted. The Jews, both Infidel, and Chriſtian, and Papiſts, greatly oppoſed or corrupted this doctrine. The church of Rome not only dangerouſly corrupt it, by aſcribing it to their own merits, penance, pilgrimages, th

merits of the ſaints, and works of *congruo*, that deſerve grace; and of *condigno*, (after they have got the grace that was meet to their congruity,) that deſerve eternal life; and works of ſupererogation, that make God a debtor, which is an old doctrine of the Aſcetics in the ſecond century, according to their pretended double rule of ſanctity, ordinary and extraordinary, viz. precepts and councils. If man had any faculty or power that he did not receive from God, then he would not be obliged to employ it in his ſervice; but he is but a ſteward of what he poſſeſſes, as he has nothing but what he received, nothing being his own. And though he did every duty required, and did no evil forbidden, yet he would be but an unprofitable ſervant, Luke xvii. 10.; but the caſe is otherwiſe, 1 Kings viii. 46. 2 Chron. vi. 36. Eccl. vii. 20. Rom. iii. 23. James iii. 2.

Juſtification is that which the profeſſors of all religions, Pagan, Mahometan, Jewiſh, and Chriſtian, by their various methods of religious worſhip, and exerciſes of devotion, chiefly ſought after, viz. how to obtain pardon and acceptance with God, being ſenſible they had offended. But juſtification is not only corrupted as to the means and matter of it, but alſo as to the nature of it; as they confound it with ſanctification, which is like confounding heaven with earth; and diſtreſſes or diſtracts the weak and tender conſcience, by making them meaſure their juſtification by their ſanctification, or miſtake the one for the other, by holding juſtification to conſiſt in the renovation of the mind, &c.; whereas juſtifica-

tion is an external act, compleated at once; but ſanctification is a work, and is imperfect during this life, being only perfected at death. See the moſt excellent definition of them, on theſe queſtions, in the Aſſembly's ſhorter catechiſm, and the ſcriptures there quoted.

2*dly*, The church of Rome holds, that baptiſm regenerates and removes original ſin, inherent and imputed, or both guilt and pollution, and thus both merits and purifies, contrary to experience and undeniable facts; for, firſt, many that are baptized die before they are capable of actual ſin, which muſt therefore be by virtue of original ſin, as death came only by ſin, Rom. v. 12. vi. 23.; for though man was made naturally capable of mortality, as his body conſiſts of parts that were capable of ſeparation, or a diſſolution, yet, by the promiſed favour or grace, he would have been immortal had he not ſinned; and none die but in conſequence of ſin, or the puniſhment of it. Secondly, Many that are baptized, when they become moral agents, or capable to diſtinguiſh between good and evil, ſhew their corruption of nature, that they are in the gall of bitterneſs, and bond of iniquity.

3*dly*, Their diſtinction of ſins into mortal and venial, which can be atoned for by themſelves, or the merits of the ſaints, or expiated by the pains of purgatory, is dangerous; as if any ſin of its own nature were not mortal, and deſerved eternal death, Gal. iii. 10. Indeed the apoſtle John ſpeaks of mortal ſins, but in another ſenſe. 1 John v. 16.; he there ſeems to allude to theſe

ſins that had no ſacrifice appointed for them by the law. The ſacrifice was the typical atonement, the emblem of the great propitiatory ſacrifice and real atonement; the ſacrifice, therefore died in place of the ſinner, having his ſins typically transferred on it, and thus bore his iniquity; but as to thoſe ſins for which no ſacrifice was appointed, the ſinner was ſaid to bear his iniquity, and die, Lev. xxiv. 15. xx. 17. Numb. ix. 13. The following are examples of theſe ſins, and of the commands of which they are tranſgreſſions: *Firſt*, Deut. xiii. 10. xvii. 5. *Second*, Exod. xxii. 20. *Third*, Lev. xxiv. 16. *Fourth*, Numb. xv. 35. *Fifth*, Exod. xxi. 15. Lev. xx. 9. *Sixth*, Lev. xxiv. 17. *Seventh*, Lev. xx. 10. xix. 13.—Numb. xv. 30. Heb. x. 26. 1 John iii. 9.

But it muſt be obſerved of all theſe ſins, that it was only ſuch as were committed wilfully, and not by ignorance, accident, or ſurpriſe, *&c.* that was thus mortal; and any ſin committed in this manner is alſo mortal in the apoſtle's ſenſe, Numb. xv. 30. Heb. x. 26. The ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt was alſo a wilful ſin as to its quality and circumſtances; but as to its kind, it ſeems to have conſiſted in aſcribing the miracles Chriſt did by the divine Spirit to the agency or power of an evil ſpirit, out of mere malice, tho' they were perfectly certain of the contrary, (Mat. xii. 28. Mark iii. 30.) and therefore could only be committed during Chriſt's perſonal miniſtry on earth, according to the opinion of the moſt eminent divines. Many divines and commentators of note ſeem very ignorantly and abſurdly to

confound Matth. xii. 28. Heb. x. 26. 1 John v. 16. and explain the one by the other. In the two latter it is evident, by the terms uſed, that the apoſtle alludes to the above-mentioned; and if David and the Gentile converts obtained pardon, theſe were extraordinary inſtances, and it was by extraordinary means uſed to bring them to repentance; the firſt by a prophet, the others by apoſtles and miracles; and many of the Gentiles were greatly ignorant of the heinouſneſs of theſe ſins mentioned 1 Cor. vi. 9.; but few even of theſe that ſhould teach others ſeem to know theſe things, or to read and conſider the laws of God contained in the Pentateuch, and only ſummed up in the ten commands; and ſeem to look on the Old Teſtament, or, at leaſt, on the five books of Moſes, as of no force now, and ſay, ſuch a thing was under the old law, or the law of Moſes, as if all the laws of Moſes were only ceremonial, and ceaſed to be of force under the goſpel: but moral laws are of eternal and unalterable obligation; and the rule to know whether they are moral or ceremonial, is to conſider, whether the things required or forbidden are duties or ſins now, as idolatry, blaſphemy, murder, adultery, *&c.* But it is argued, that, under the goſpel-diſpenſation, grace and forgiveneſs abounds more than under the law, or Old Teſtament-diſpenſation, and that there is forgiveneſs for all ſins, if ſincerely repented of; but then it is not conſidered that the author of pardon is alſo the author of repentance, Acts v. 31. xi. 18. 2 Tim. ii. 25. Heb. xii. 16. He, indeed, has inſeparably connected pardon and

repentance, and to whom he gives the one he gives the other. But inſtead of greater indulgence to ſin by the goſpel than the law, it is juſt the contrary, as under that darker diſpenſation ſins were leſs aggravated, and polygamy winked at. This would make the goſpel the miniſtry of ſin to encourage it. There are indeed remarkable inſtances of the converſion of notorious ſinners recorded by ſome, as Doddridge's converſion of Gardiner, and Burnet's converſion of Rocheſter, *&c.* As to the latter, however, the biſhop does not ſeem to be certain. But, ſays a greater divine, the converſion of an aged ſinner is the wonder of an age, yea, and that age is the wonder of ages, Jer. xiii. 23. Weak minds delight in the marvellous, and pious minds in ſuch wonders. It is more analogous to reaſon and ſcripture, that God will keep his people from ſuch ſnares. 1 John iii. 9. is explained by 1 John v. 16. Miracles and extraordinary events are not the privilege of ordinary times. Some may think, that theſe mortal ſins were puniſhed only with temporal death, but then they were driven away in their wickedneſs; and others may think, that this was rather to be conſidered as a civil, or political, or, in the Rabinic ſenſe, a judicial puniſhment of them, as ſtate-crimes; becauſe they hold, that idolatry was thus puniſhed as rebellion againſt the civil magiſtrate, as under their theocracy God was their King.

Some governments in the reformed churches puniſhed adultery with death; and there is an act of the Britiſh parliament in force againſt it; and many Heathens puniſhed it with death. (See

Roſs's Hiſtory.) The primitive church had not the civil power of life and death over perſons, but it excluded adulterers for ever from the communion of the church, which was an eccleſiaſtic death; no tears or intreaties could gain admiſſion. The evidence of repentance conſiſts in reſtitution, or reparation of the injury done; but there can be nothing ſuch performed for the breach of the ſixth command, as the life taken away cannot be reſtored. Therefore ſays the apoſtle, 1 John iii. 15.; in one inſtance reparation can be made for the breach of the ſeventh command, Deut. xxii. 28. In other inſtances there can be no reſtitution, and therefore death was inflicted, as adultery, inceſt, and all unnatural luſts. The beſt regulated Pagans, who had only the light and law of nature to guide them, acted according to the written law in Deut. xxii. 28. Lev. xx. 10. ; which ſhews, that both the law of nature and the written law are from the ſame author, as in this natural and ſupernatural light agreed, Rom. ii. 14, 15.

4th, The doctrine of the church of Rome is dangerouſly corrupted concerning the pardon of ſin, and repentance the mean of it; by ſubſtituting penance, in a great meaſure, in place of it, and particularly in granting exemption from that penance to be purchaſed by money; not conſidering, that repentance is abſolutely neceſſary in order to obtain pardon, as no ſin can be actually pardoned till it be actually repented of. Repentance is the reparation of an injury done, undoing what was done amiſs, or making reſtitution. Without reparation there

can be no remiſſion and ſalvation, therefore there muſt either be reſtitution or damnation. Repentance regards either God or man, according as ſins are committed againſt either the firſt or ſecond table of the law: ſins againſt the firſt table of the law are more directly and immediately committed againſt God. Repentance towards God conſiſts in ceaſing to do evil, and learning to do well, (from a change of heart proceeds this change of life,) and alſo doubling diligence in time to come; and thus redeeming the time paſt, by doing the work of both the paſt and the future in the time to come. This is the proper meaning of redeeming the time. Thus Paul laboured more abundantly than all the apoſtles, and built up the church much faſter than he pulled it down.

Sins againſt the ſecond table of the law, that are more immediately and directly againſt man, require reſtitution, as eſſential to true repentance, being the only true mark, evidence, or fruit of a change of heart. We obſerved, that reparation cannot be made for the breach of the ſixth command, and that it can be made in one inſtance for the breach of the ſeventh, and is enjoined by the law of God, Deut. xx. 28.; or if the father utterly refuſed to give his daughter, he being wholly in his power, and at his diſpoſal, then a dowry or ſubſiſtance was to be given her, which was ſome kind of reparation or compenſation.

Actual repentance for the breach of the eighth command conſiſts in reſtoring what was taken away, or the equivalent, whether by direct or

indirect theft, as fraud, deceit, extortion, oppreſſion, *&c.* Repentance does not conſiſt in faſting and praying only, or in church-cenſures, as ſome imagine; that is but deceiving one's ſelf, and the world, and a ſolemn mockery of God, if there be no reparation. Can any be ſaid to repent, conſiſtently with common ſenſe, who ſtill retain their neighbour's property unjuſtly, and do not reſtore it? It is plain they are not truly ſorry for it, even tho' they may wiſh they had not done it, and more eſpecially if they intend to go on in the ſame practices. Nay, they are not truly humbled for their ſins, nor alarmed of the danger of them, who are not willing to do whatever is commanded, however it may be contrary to their honour, or intereſt, or natural ſenſe, Luke xix. 8. Acts ix. 6.

The fathers, from whom I have collected theſe ſentiments concerning ſin and repentance, were very particular with regard to the mode of reſtitution. If the perſon wronged be dead, reſtitution is to be made to the next heir; if none is ſo found, it is to be dedicated to the ſervice of God and religion, or beſtowed in donations of charity to the poor.

The civil laws of modern nations, that profeſs revealed religion, and engage thereby to walk by the law of God therein contained, are very inconſiſtent and unjuſt, in taking away life for theft, &c. Nothing one can ſteal can be equivalent to his life, though he ſhould ſteal the whole world, and run away with it on his back: but, according to the law of God, if he has ſquandered away what he took, and has not

wherewith to make reparation, he ſhould be ſold for it; and this is ſtill granting him his life, and he ſhould reſtore ſo many fold as the circumſtances of aggravation require, Exod. xxii. But yet no law can properly be ſaid to be too ſevere, if it was known before it was tranſgreſſed; for, as a great divine ſays concerning thoſe that complain eternal puniſhments are too ſevere, none complain of it but thoſe for whom they were not ſevere enough to keep them from them.

Sparing the life of a murderer is adopting his crime. There are various ways whereby we can be partakers of other men's ſins, and thereby muſt partake of their puniſhments; as by adviſing or compelling to ſin, ſupporting and defending it, as ſome barriſters or pleaders do for their clients; or by not hindering ſin if we can, or leading others to it by our example. Guilt does not divide, but it multiplies. If a hundred men be all engaged in committing one murder, they are all equally guilty as if only one had done it.

Reſtitution for the breach of the ninth command is more difficult than for the foregoing, as a falſehood once ſpread cannot be eaſily ſtopped or recalled. Indeed it is ſeldom poſſible, unleſs it be done immediately before it ſpread. Evil ſpeaking againſt man conſiſts in lying alone, either directly or indirectly, by magnifying and miſrepreſenting, or making things worſe than they are; for the truth can never be evil, and it is doing one no injury to ſay the truth, and only wicked perſons fear it. On account of the difficulty of reparation here, and the baſeneſs of

this moſt common vice, attacking one behind his back, or in his abſence, ſo that he has no means to defend himſelf; and as it is by one's character only that he can have commerce with ſociety, and live in it, a good name or reputation being dearer than life, on theſe accounts lying is branded as the worſt of crimes, (as it is turning light to darkneſs;) and a particular denunciation is made againſt liars, Rev. xxi. 8. John viii. 44.

It is obſerved, that the Roman doctors uſually tranſlate repentance, penance; and to practiſe or perform repentance is to do penance; by which they mean great ſeverities inflicted on the body, as whipping, or wounding themſelves, &c. cruelties, or ſevere faſtings, or pilgrimages, which is not the mortifying of evil appetites and diſpoſitions, and crucifying the luſts, corrupt affections, paſſions, and deſires, the apoſtles preſcribe. It may kill the body, but not the luſts, and ſerves to nouriſh ſpiritual pride, Luke xviii. 12. Committing cruelties on the body is a breach of the ſixth command. An eminent phyſician and divine indeed preſcribed faſting and exerciſe for purity, and health of body, and faſting and prayer (which is exerciſe of mind) for the ſame qualities of mind; but it is ſubſervient to that purpoſe only to a certain degree. Penance can never merit or procure atonement for ſin; it is no repairing the injury done by it to God or man; it is only a falſe deluſive peace that it procures. Their doctrine of ſupererogation proceeds from the moſt deplorable ignorance, pride, and vanity, as was obſerved before.

Their doctrine of the merits of the apoſtles, ſaints, and martyrs, that the church has in keeping, to diſpoſe of to thoſe that need them, is another dangerous deluſion to fill the Pope's coffers; if theſe excelled others, or had more grace to bear greater ſufferings, perſecution, martyrdom, &c. they were greater debtors to free grace; and as grace is a degree of glory, or the beginning of it, ſo that they differ not in kind but in degree, they are capable of higher degrees of glory, 2 Cor. iii. 5. 1 Cor. iv. 4. James iii. 2.

This is alſo derogatory to the merits of Chriſt, as if they were not ſufficient, or as if he did not beſtow them freely, or as if they would not be indebted to them.

5*thly*, Confeſſion to a prieſt is another way to a falſe peace, James v. 16.; if we have offended, or injured one another, confeſſion or acknowledgment is a part of repentance; and when God alone is offended, confeſſion ought to be to him alone, for ſecret ſins of either omiſſion or commiſſion, that no ſcandal be given to ſociety; confeſſion is to be made to the party offended, and forgiveneſs aſked, and to deſire them to pray God for it, as Abimelech did Abraham. Here it is to be obſerved, that no ſin againſt either God or man can be actually forgiven till it be actually repented of. God forgives none but thoſe that repent; and man is not bound to do it, as it would encourage ſin, and the repetition of injuries. There may perhaps be two exceptions, firſt, when one knows of an enemy dying, he ſhould forgive him be-

fore he die; and none ought to die without forgiving his enemies. But indeed perſons ſhould apply to their ſpiritual guides, and experienced ſaints, for ſolution of doubts, or caſes of conſcience, which will lead them to diſcover ſome ſecret ſins to them.

6thly, But their moſt dangerous doctrines about ſin are theſe of abſolutions and indulgences, and thus diſpenſing with the divine law, which perfectly anſwers the character given of the man of ſin, 2 Theſ. ii. 4.; and they will not only give abſolution for the moſt horrid crimes, but alſo hold them highly meritorious, if in their ſtile it be for the good of the church, as deſtroying heretics, even though they be parents, Rom. iii. 8. Matth. xvi. 19. John xx. 23. can be underſtood only declaratively, authoritatively in the name of Chriſt, as his ambaſſadors, and by authority and commiſſion from him, ſolemnly declaring pardon to the true penitent, and in the exerciſe of church-diſcipline, or that power derived from the king and head of the church, which he hath committed to church-officers, to excommunicate and exclude the impenitent and diſobedient from the privileges and communion of the church: And this excluding the ſcandalous, and admitting the penitent, is the binding and looſing on earth which ſhall be ratified in heaven. The yearly confeſſions and abſolutions, ſome of which are obtained by money, are dangerous deluſions, to lull conſcience aſleep in ſecurity, or a falſe perſuaſion of peace.

The word *abſolution*, in the primitive and Proteſtant churches, is uſed to ſignify, that th

delinquent is ſet free from church-cenſure, and received again into the communion of the church, and the participation of the ordinances and privileges of it, and thus acquit or freed from their ſtate of ſcandal; and if their profeſſion of repentance be ſincere, they obtain alſo forgiveneſs of God. When the Jews accuſed Chriſt of blaſphemy in forgiving ſins, which none could do but God, and thereby aſſuming God's prerogative, he removed the effect of them, and thereby ſhewed he had power to do it. No man but Alexander the Great, the Pope and his clergy, ever pretended to forgive ſins, for we never find the apoſtles doing it; but let Papiſts remove the effects of it, as our Saviour did, and then the world will be convinced they can pardon it. But ſome of them, being now aſhamed of ſuch a practice, aſſert, that they only ſolemnly declare, that the confeſſors obtain forgiveneſs, if they ſincerely repent of their ſins they have confeſſed.

Their doctrine of indulgencies is yet more dreadful, giving the licentious a liberty to do what they pleaſe, contrary to both law and goſpel, 1 John iii. 4. Rom. vi. 1. and even making vice virtue, if for the good of their church, as was obſerved before. This is what it is morally impoſſible for God to do, and makes the ſucceſſion of Popes anſwer the character given of the man of ſin, 2 Theſ. ii. 4.

Indulgence and penance in the primitive church meant the relaxing a part of the uſual diſcipline to one that was more caſt down than ordinary, and increaſing it to the hardened and obſtinate

who were diſobedient to the church, Luke x. 16. But Popery metamorphoſed or perverted almoſt all things, and turned them upſide down.

Their faſt of Lent is a yearly penance, in which they pretend to imitate our Saviour's forty days faſt in the wilderneſs; herein they ſhew the moſt deplorable ignorance and miſunderſtanding; for we are not to imitate his Mediatorial or miraculous acts, of which his faſting forty days was one; we are to imitate only his moral actions; but they generally feaſt as well then as at any other time of the year, by only uſing fiſh inſtead of fleſh, a more libidinous diet; nor will the pretence, that ſince the Gaderene's ſwine run all into the ſea, make ſwine fiſh ever after; its a mere abſurdity, to call abſtaining from fleſh a partial faſt, or low diet. However, keeping Lent, *i. e.* low diet, properly, longer or ſhorter in the year, might tend to promote health of body, and the growth of religion, if not uſed in that miſtaken notion. Their Friday's faſts have more appearance of propriety.

7thly, The doctrine of the ſacraments is alſo dangerouſly corrupted in the church of Rome, both by additions to the true ones, and adding falſe ones. They make them eſſentially neceſſary to ſalvation; whereas, it is not ſo much the want, as the wilful neglect of the ordinances and means of ſalvation, which God hath appointed, that conſtitutes the danger. Deiſts and profligates, that wilfully neglect, or reject and deſpiſe the goſpel, and the ordinances or mean

of ſalvation therein appointed, are indeed without excuſe, Heb. ii. 3. This doctrine of the neceſſity of baptiſm is accompanied with another, viz. that the external performance of duties, or *opus operatum*, as they call it, is ſufficient; contrary to Tim. iv. 8. as of old, it was not the excellency of the ſacrifice, but the diſpoſition of the offerer, that God valued; without ſuitable diſpoſitions, and a ſuitable converſation, their ſacrifices were declared to be an abomination, Iſaiah i. They alſo hold, that the ſacraments confer grace of themſelves; and that the intention of the prieſt is neceſſary to the right adminiſtration of them. That the ſacraments, and other ordinances, have no virtue in themſelves, or from him that adminiſtrates them, is evident from this undeniable fact, that if it were ſo, all that have the ordinances diſpenſed by a good man would be equally benefited, whereas ſome profit by them, and others not. It is therefore evident, that the benefit muſt depend, not on them, or the intention of the adminiſtrator, but on the divine bleſſing, and the right preparation for, and improvement of them, by thoſe that attend them, 1 Cor. iii. 6, 7. 1 Pet. iii. 21. therefore neither the ordinances nor adminiſtrators confer grace. As they make baptiſm abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation, they authorize laics, and even midwives to do it in ſome caſes. What horrid ſacrilege and profanity! Eph. iv. 11. 1 Cor. xiv. 35.; and children that die unbaptized they ſend to ſome place they call Limbus, nobody knows where, if in God's creation, where there is neither happineſs nor miſery; but their mid-

dle ſtates will fall under conſideration afterwards.

The word baptiſm ſignifies the application of water by ſprinkling, or any other way, as we will ſee afterwards; but to the element of water they add chriſm, or oil, ſalt, ſpittle, and the croſs, &c. without foundation from ſcripture or the Apoſtolic church. Vain emblems, and ſuperſtitions of human device, corrupting the purity of divine inſtitutions! Matth. xv. 9. Rev. xxii. 18.

But their corruptions of the Lord's ſupper are yet greater, firſt, by aſſerting, that the elements of bread and wine have their ſubſtance changed into into the real body and blood of Chriſt, by conſecration; and thus a wafer god is created by the benediction of a prieſt, and worſhipped by them; as it is wafers they uſe inſtead of bread, contrary to the ſcripture-inſtitution and example. This doctrine is contrary to the teſtimony of the ſenſes, reaſon, philoſophy, the ſcriptures, and the nature of a ſacrament. Firſt, it is contrary to the ſenſes, as they inform us it is ſtill bread and wine as it was before; and if we cannot credit our ſenſes, then we have no evidence of our Saviour's miracles, or reſurrection, or even of his perſon; then there's an end to all moral evidence; we ſee, feel, taſte, and ſmell, that there is no tranſubſtantiation.

Their new invented philoſophy, that a ſubſtance may be changed, and its accidents ſtill remain, is another palpable abſurdity, unknown to true philoſophers; and is rather like magic, than

philoſophy. Secondly, This doctrine is contrary to reaſon and true philoſophy; that a body which is limited in its nature, can be in heaven and on earth, and in as many places as the ſacrament is diſpenſed in at once, at the ſame time. Thirdly, It is contrary to ſcripture, which aſſerts, that the heavens muſt contain Chriſt's body till the time of the reſtitution of all things. Fourthly, It is contrary to the nature of a ſacrament, which conſiſts of a ſign, and a thing ſignified; for if they become one and the ſame, it ceaſes to be a ſacrament; then it is not a memorial, for that is a remembrance of ſomething abſent, but it ceaſes to be ſo when the thing is preſent.

This is the Achillan abſurdity in the Roman church. Though they will not allow this to be figurative, but take it literally, yet they are obliged to admit of a figure in one thing, for they own, that by drinking the cup is meant the wine in the cup; the like figure is uſed 1 Cor. x. 4. John xv. 1. x. 1. when the Jews took his telling them of the eating his fleſh, and drinking his blood literally, John vi. 50. and were ſhocked at it, he told them, that it would not profit them though they ſhould do it literally. But by the eating, &c. is meant, receiving the benefits procured by the bruiſing of his body, and ſhedding his blood; viz. the life he procured, by taking on him the human nature, and ſuffering in it for us; and he is ſpiritually preſent in his ordinances to the ſouls of believers, and feaſts them with the food of life;

he is the light of the world, and the life of men in his ordinances.

When he inſtituted the ſupper, his body was not broken, nor his blood ſhed; but they cannot mean it of his real body, but one like it, or a multiplication of it. The ſupper is ſacramentally or ſymbollically his body and blood. The conſecrated wafer, which they call maſs, they carry about in proceſſion, and worſhip it, which is idolatry, and pretend to offer it up a ſacrifice for ſins. Chriſt did not offer his ſacrifice twice, firſt, when he inſtituted the ſupper, and ſecondly, on the croſs; this would be contrary to Heb. x. 10, 14. but their practice would be offering it often. Chriſt was the only prieſt that could offer ſacrifice on the only altar before-mentioned; and the ſupper is a commemoration of his ſacrifice, or a feaſt upon it, or in memorial of it; and the virtue of his ſacrifice reached to the beginning of the world as well as to the end of it; therefore he is called the Lamb ſlain from the beginning of the world, and he was typically ſo in the ſacrifices; moral effects may be before their cauſes, Heb. iv. 3. Rev. xiii. 8. Laſtly, they divide and half the ſacrament, giving the people only one half, by denying them the cup; contrary to the expreſs words of the inſtitution, where the cup is ſeveral times mentioned; and as it were on purpoſe to prevent this practice, it is ſaid, Drink ye all of it; and it is evident, that the apoſtle, 1 Cor. xi. is addreſſing the laity.

This practice of depriving the laity of the cup is contrary to the practice of the primitive and

the Greek church, which adminiſtered it in both kinds; if the ſhedding of his blood was neceſſary, as well as the breaking of his body, then the cup is neceſſary, as the ſymbol of it, as well as the other.

The church of Rome adds other five ſacraments to theſe, viz. confirmation, penance, extreme unction, orders, matrimony.

In order to ſettle this matter, two things muſt be conſidered, *1ſt*, the inſtitution, *2dly*, the parts of a ſacrament. *1ſt*, A ſacrament is an ordinance inſtituted by Chriſt; none but the head of the church could inſtitute ſacraments, as none but he could confer the benefits thereby ſignified, without which they are but empty ſigns; but there are no more ſacraments than two inſtituted by him. *2dly*, As to the parts of a ſacrament, it conſiſts of matter and form; the matter in baptiſm is water, and the form applying it in the name of, &c. with repeating the words of the inſtitution. But none of the Popiſh ſacraments have any ſenſible matter but extreme unction; it has oil, but then it was not inſtituted by Chriſt, and it was uſed only as a medicine, James v. 14.; their ſophiſtry about metaphyſical matter, that comes not under the cognizance of the ſenſes, as that in penance, the contrition is the matter; and in marriage, the conſent of parties, is too abſurd and ridiculous to deſerve notice.

What the Greeks call myſteries, the Latins rendered ſacrament; but then, in the common acceptation of the word, all myſteries are not ſacraments; the Vulgate renders Eph. v. 32. a grand

ſacrament, where it is evident, from the ſcope of the place, or analogy of the text, that the apoſtle is there ſpeaking of the myſtical union of Chriſt and believers, and comparing it to that of huſband and wife.

8*th*, As the church of Rome adds other ſacraments to the true ones, ſo ſhe alſo adds other Mediators to the true one. The ſcripture tells us, there is one God and one Mediator between God and man, 1 Tim. ii. 5. To which they reply, that they own but one Mediator of redemption, but more of interceſſion. This point we ſhall examine with ſome preciſion, as it is leſs obvious, and more ready to be miſtaken than others. It is true, that the apoſtle enjoins interceſſion for all men, 1 Tim. ii. 1. and that the ſaints on earth intercede or pray for one another; but this is not like Chriſt's interceſſion, for his interceſſion is founded on his oblation, or atonement, and therefore he aſks nothing but what he purchaſed; but the ſaints have no merit to plead upon for either themſelves or others; they cannot therefore be ſaid to intercede in the ſenſe Chriſt does. But the Papiſts doctrine of their ſuperior merits above what was needful for themſelves, is the foundation of their miſtake here; and they even laid more ſtreſs on the Virgin Mother's interceſſion than Chriſt's, and formerly prayed her to command her Son; tho', being aſhamed of it now, they uſe a ſofter expreſſion; but ſhe had no authority over him as to his mediatorial acts, and thoſe of his divine power; and he rebuked her ſharply when ſhe interfered as to theſe, though ſhe only ſignified

the need of exhibiting his divine power, John ii. 3.

But the chief queſtion is, Whether the glorified ſtate of the ſaints in heaven admits of a ſenſe of our caſe? Though they interceded for us on earth, they were then members of the ſame ſociety, and it was in ſome ſort interceding for themſelves, becauſe the ſaints are of mutual benefit to one another. Communion means not only a common intereſt, but a communication of benefits, as the gifts of inſtruction, knowledge, *&c.*; and, being in the ſame ſituation, they had a ſympathetic feeling of our wants, *&c.* But in heaven the caſe is quite altered with them; they are in a different ſtate, and it is perhaps not competent either to them or angels to pray for us; though the angels, being meſſengers ſent to guard the faithful, learn thereby much from the church, yea, and are ſaid to rejoice at the converſion of ſinners, Luke xv. 10. Eph. iii. 10. yet the ſcripture ſays, the ſaints are ignorant of us, Iſa. lxiii. 16. And though the benevolence of angels and ſaints in heaven may be greater than of ſaints on earth, yet that does not imply the conſequence they draw from it. A ſaint or angel, which can be but in one place at a time, could not hear ſaints praying to them from many diſtant places at the ſame time; and to alledge they know our ſtate by revelation or inſpiration, implies ſtrange abſurdities; as that God conſtitutes them mediators, and, for that end, reveals what is neceſſary for them to know; and all this derogates from the honour of the true Mediator, as if his merits and interceſſion were not ſufficient;

which implies blaſphemy, contrary to the whole tenor of the ſcripture, which declares him an all-ſufficient Saviour. But the matter is determined at once by this reaſon, that there is no foundation for it in ſcripture; and making additions to ſcripture-inſtitutions is called ſetting up altars beſides God's, as it were to rival him in wiſdom; but he will never accept of what he does not appoint, but ſeverely condemns.

From this notion of the interceſſion of ſaints and angels proceeds that practice of giving them adoration or worſhip. They call this *duleia*, or an inferior kind of worſhip, or a half-worſhip; but it is only an inferior kind of idolatry, Col. ii. 18. Rev. xxii. 9. We are told, indeed, in the Old Teſtament, that the patriarch worſhipped the angel that appeared, or payed him homage or reſpect; and if that be religious worſhip, it ſeems to be contradicted by theſe texts in the New Teſtament. But it is acknowledged by all, that the angel, or meſſenger of the covenant, is an appellation given to Chriſt; and therefore when we read of worſhip given the angel, it can be underſtood only of him who is the uncreated Angel of the covenant. But the Papiſts uſe a groſſer worſhip and adoration than that of angels and ſaints, viz. that of pictures, images, the crucifix, and relics of ſaints, &c. and frame images of God himſelf, all contrary to the letter of the ſecond command, and other ſcriptures, Deut. xvi. 22. iv. 16, 18, 23, 25. Papiſts generally leave out the ſecond command out of their books, becauſe it condemns them; tho' ſome do yet worſe, by trying to wreſt it. They

that leave it out divide the tenth into two, to make up the number, and make the coveting a man's wife a different command from coveting his goods.

The worſhipping of God by images, and the invocation of ſaints, though they may ſeem not to be direct idolatry, but ſuperſtition wearing an idolatrous form, yet they ſurely are not inferior to the worſhip given to the calf by the Iſraelites, which is called idolatry; and their pretending to have the brazen ſerpent, and to have found the croſs, ſpear, *&c.* are all fables, 2 Kings xviii. 4.

9*th*, The doctrine of purgatory is another groſs corruption of popery; this is borrowed from paganiſm, like many others of their corruptions, but they wreſt ſome ſcriptures to ſupport it, as 1 Pet. iii. 19. We ſhall examine this text by the rules of interpretation: It is evident, from the analogy of the text, that the ſpirit by which Chriſt went and preached to the ſpirits in priſon was that ſpirit which quickened his body, and raiſed him from the dead; now that was not his ſoul or human ſpirit, but the divine Spirit, for only the divine power can raiſe the dead; that almighty power, which gave life at firſt only can reſtore it; by this ſpirit he went and preached by the miniſtry of Noah. The long-ſuffering of God waited in the days of Noah 120 years, for ſo long did he preach repentance and righteouſneſs to that wicked and diſobedient generation, whoſe ſpirits were now in the priſon of hell; he preached not only by his words, but by his actions, in preparing a refuge for himſelf

and family from the flood; nor will this place ſerve to prove *limbus patruum*, for the fathers were not in a priſon, but in heaven, Luke xvi. 25.

Some of the ancients thought that Chriſt's ſoul, after death, went to the infernal regions, and conquered the devil in his own dominions, and ſpoiled him of his prey; but it is not ſaid they were brought out of priſon. They alſo interpret 1 Cor. iii. 12. of the corruptions of venial ſins, and of the fire of purgatory; but it is plain from the analogy of the text, that good and bad doctrines are there meant; the fire is alſo metaphorically to be underſtood of ſome ſevere trial of perſecution, or the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, or rather the day of judgment. He that holds the true foundation Chriſt, but yet builds a ſuperſtitious ſuperſtructure, having the true foundation, he will endure, but yet with difficulty and danger, as one that breaks through the flames when his houſe is on fire, and will loſe all his labour of human inventions, corruptions &c. ſuperſtitions in religion. As gold endures the fire, and the droſs is conſumed, ſo the divine inſtitutions he holds will endure, but the human will not. Thus we ſee, that there's no foundation from the ſcriptures they alledge to ſupport that doctrine; but though we find no ſuch doctrine in the ſcripture, we will find it elſewhere; for it is the current notion of the Greeks and Romans, and other Heathens, as all who are converſant in their authors will ſee. Virgil gives the following account of it, Æneid, vi. ver. 740.

Spirits that are clogged by noxious bodies

blunted by earth-born material ſickly dying members, from this union and incumbrance, are ſubjected to various paſſions, as grief, joy, fear, deſire; and being ſhut up in a dark and gloomy priſon, loſe ſight of their native ſkies; nay, even when with the beſt beams of light, their life is gone, yet not every ill nor all corporeal ſtains are quite removed from theſe unhappy beings; and it is abſolutely unavoidable, that many vicious habits, which have long grown up with the ſoul, ſhould be ſtrangely riveted therein; therefore are they afflicted with pains, and pay the penalty of their former ills: ſome, hung on high, are ſpread out to whiten in the empty wind; in others, the guilt not done away is waſhed out in the watery abyſs, or burnt away in fire. We have each of us his dæmon, from whom we ſuffer till length of time has done away the inherent ſtain, and hath left celeſtial reaſon pure from all irregular paſſions in the ſoul, that ſpark of heavenly fire, in its original purity and brightneſs ſimple and unmixed; then are they conveyed into elyſium, and they who are the happy few poſſeſs the fields of bliſs. Thus we ſee their chaſtiſements are ſuppoſed to be of three kinds, according to the nature of the ſtains and pollutions with which the ſouls were infected. If their ſtains were more ſlight and ſuperficial, they were bleached away in the wind, or waſhed away in the water, but theſe of a deeper die were burnt out by fire; all theſe are purifying, and uſed as emblems of moral purity. As the ghoſts of the dead are ſuppoſed to haunt and diſturb the living from whom they ſuffered injuries, ſo here

they are ſaid to ſuffer puniſhments by dæmons or manes, fiends and furies; but the tormenting dæmons of the other world are the ſtings and remorſe of conſcience. *N. B.* When the ſoul leaves the body, it loſes the appetites and deſires for its enjoyments; as when one loſes ſight or hearing, he loſes the deſire for ſounds and colours: but how the material elements of air, water, and fire, can purify immaterial ſpirits, is a problem.

The ſcripture ſpeaks only of two places for departed ſpirits after death, viz. heaven and hell, and the ſociety of God and angels, or of devils. And as for the middle region, or purgatory, it is not to be found in God's creation; but by means of this fable they can have what money they pleaſe; as it would be a mortal ſin for any to retain a farthing and leave their friends in purgatory; it is the richeſt fund the church poſſeſſes. As for the ſtories of putting into the coffin a candle to ſee, a hammer to knock at the door, and a ſixpence to pay the porter, and praying them ſo far out for ſo much, and thus procuring their releaſe by degrees, as the head, ſhoulders, &c. I ſhall paſs them over. Repentance is the true purgatory. The fathers, with their fertile fancies, allegorized the penitent's ſtate of mind, repreſenting it as a place, which may perhaps have induced the papiſts to take their allegory as a real repreſentation; they repreſented it as a dark ſubterraneous vault, or deep cavern under ground, in which they were tortur'd on a wheel and rack, and ſcorch'd with fire; repreſenting thereby the ſtings of horror and re-

morſe, the rack and anguiſh of a guilty conſcience, the horrors of divine wrath, and the curſe of the fiery law preſent before them. And in like manner, the poet perſonifies repentance;

She, in a doleful thorny arbour, ſat,
Weeping alone her miſerable ſtate;
Her eyes would ſeem diſolv'd in briny tears,
Which flowing forth water'd the tender graſs.

Repentance is an emetic to the mind, making it vomit up the deadly poiſon it ſwallowed down.

Affliction is another purgatory, to purify the mind from ſenſual affections, and earthly vanities; it ſhewed the wiſeſt of men the vanity of all earthly enjoyments, that its pleaſures, riches, honours, pomp, and glory, &c. can afford no comfort in time of greateſt need, in diſtreſs, old age, and at death. Every youth ſhould read the book of Eccleſiaſtes every week, as an antidote againſt the ſnares of the world; it is the true natural philoſophy. Death is alſo another purgatory, though only for the body; which will be purified by death and the reſurrection, from the dregs of earthly droſs, and ſuch groſs materials, as fleſh and blood; and will not thereafter be ſubject to dull and heavy hours of ſleep, or hunger, thirſt, wearineſs, the ſeeds of diſeaſes, decay, old age and death; but be pure and tranſparent like the light, and ſhine like the ſun, and flouriſh in immortal vigour and youth, Matt. xiii. 43. 1 Cor. xv. 50. Phil. iii. 21. All ſins are remitted in juſtification, either virtually or actually; and they are actually pardoned, when actually repented of, and there's a final abſolution,

by a particular judgment of every one at death; and a public judicial acquittance in the day of judgment.

Matth. xii. 32. is either to be underſtood in the ſame ſenſe as Heb. ii. 5. ſignifying the goſpel diſpenſation, which was yet to come when Chriſt was on earth; or it is a proverbial phraſe, as the Syriac ſcholiaſt obſerves, like the examples he gives: They that labour under a diſeaſe of the tongue cannot be cured, neither in this world nor in that to come. To the ſame purpoſe are the following phraſes, He ſpoke neither good nor bad, *i. e.* nothing; Neither on the right hand nor on the left, *i. e.* no where. And this text muſt be explained by the ſupreme rule of interpretation, the analogy of faith, or ſcripture-doctrine; and there is no countenance for remiſſion after this life any where. The Jews had imbibed many notions from the Heathen philoſophers, particularly the Platonic; and though Judas Maccabeus had ſuch a notion as praying for the dead, as the Apocrypha is not of the canon, it is nothing to the purpoſe. The ſcripture ſpeaks of an immediate tranſition from this world to either heaven or hell, and knows no ſuch middle ſtate as purgatory, Luke xvi. 22. 23, 43. 2 Cor. v. 8. Philip. i. 23.

I apprehend that I have now conſidered the chief abſurdities of Popery. I ſhall ſoon conclude this ſubject, leſt I weary the reader. As for their vows of celibacy, if they unite chaſtity with them, they are more like the celeſtial ſtate, Matth. xxii. 30.; and it is queſtioned, if Gen. i. 28. ix. 1. be now in force, as the earth is ſo

repleniſhed that they are deſtroying one another by wars and oppreſſion, and ſeizing one another's properties by violence; ſo that it is a queſtion if ſuch a vow be unlawful now, that it were therefore better to break it than to keep it: and as clerical celibacy is not a precept but a council of the church, to keep them free of worldly cares and affairs, it is highly praiſe-worthy, if it be not impoſed and made a law by cuſtom. Tho' Paul had no wife, yet all the apoſtles were not ſo, for it is certain Peter had one, Mat. viii. 14. and it is no where ſaid he put her away, as they alledge. Paul commends celibacy, 1 Cor. vii. eſpecially in times of perſecution, when they had no certain dwelling-place, but he does not command it; but the Arabian proverb is good, *Melius eſt uxorem ducere, quam uri in concupiſcentia.*

10*th*. There is another hereſy we muſt yet conſider, viz. not keeping faith with heretics, which makes them utterly unfit for commerce or ſociety with any but thoſe of their own profeſſion. Though worldly buſineſs and religion are different things, yet they thus confound them, and by this principle they commit perjury and rebellion, in breaking oaths of allegeance, and perſecution, murder, &c. as of John Huſs, &c. &c. In this, and many other things, they act directly contrary to the command of God, 1 Pet. ii. 12. Rom. xiii. 1. The Iſraelites kept faith with the Gibeonites, though they were impoſed on by them.

Popery is a mixture of all religions, and has ſome things more abſurd than any religion. Purgatory is from the Pagans, as has been already

obſerved. *Lumbus Infantum* is the Mahometan araf. They have four ſubterranean, or infernal regions, viz. hell, purgatory, the limb of infants, and the limb of the fathers, that died before Chriſt aroſe and aſcended to heaven, to lead the way to them.

The canonized ſaints and angel-mediators, and the duleia worſhip given them, are analogous to the inferior deities and idolatries of the Heathens, or like the Iſraelites worſhipping the Lord together with the golden calf in the wilderneſs, and Jeroboam and the ten tribes worſhipping the calves. They give the Virgin a higher degree of worſhip than the reſt, which they call *hyperduleia*, and ſay, that it is only the Heathen idolatry that is condemned in ſcripture, and that idols are images of what is not, ſo the image of God, *&c.* are not idols. Their ſacrifice of the maſs, feſtivals, altar, holy places, muſical inſtruments, *&c.* are analogous to the Jewiſh ceremonies that are aboliſhed, Col. ii. 8. xvi. &c. Gal. iv. 10. v. 1. Heb. x. 10, 14.

Pardoning ſin is aſſuming God's prerogative, and giving indulgences to commit ſin, even parricide, if for the intereſt of their church; and alſo holding it a high virtue, is making vice virtue, and virtue vice, and diſannulling the eternal law, which God cannot do, 2 Theſſ. ii. 4.

Heathens are ſo ſhocked at tranſubſtantiation, that their philoſophers hold Chriſtians the moſt abſurd monſters in the world, to eat the God they worſhip. Hence the ſtory of the Pope in his travels through the inferior regions being denied acceſs to the palace of Pluto by the por-

ter, leſt he that eat his god above might eat the devil below. Popery is a novelty, the moſt of its abſurdities were but matters of opinion before the council of Trent, which made them articles of faith in 1545: and the firſt biſhop of Rome that obtained the title of Pope was Boniface III. about 606. Chriſtianity is 600 years older than Popery.

In the days of yore there lived a tyrant called Procruſtes, he thought himſelf to be of a proper ſtature, and meaſured all men by his ſtandard; thoſe that were ſhorter he ſtretched to his full length, and cut off the feet and legs of ſuch as were longer. Popery takes away the liberty of the exerciſe of private judgment, and requires implicit faith and blind obedience to the church, as if the Pope were God, and therefore lord of the conſcience: he denies mankind the uſe of their ſenſes and reaſon, and requires them to act contrary to them. That apology will not ſerve at the laſt judgment, that tho' they acted contrary to their ſenſes and reaſon, and the word of God, they are not accountable for it, but the church that required them to do ſo: every man muſt give account for himſelf, and therefore ſhould judge for himſelf, 2 Cor. v. 10. Col. ii. 18. 1 Cor. xi. 13. It was obſerved before, that no perſon, church, or nation, is allowed to be a judge in their own cauſe, for they would juſtify themſelves and condemn their oppoſites, Prov. xviii. 17. The Jews have ſtrictly obſerved the conduct of Chriſtians in all ages, and they are equally averſe and oppoſite to all parties, and therefore are the moſt neutral and unexception-

able judges; and they declare, they can never join the Chriſtian church while there is idolatry in it, for they abhor it above all crimes, and ſay of every calamity that befals them, that there is a part of the puniſhment of their firſt idolatry, the golden calf, in it. They abhor Popiſh idolatry, and their female god. However, it is probable, that as mankind become more and more enlightened by the progreſs of learning and knowledge, that the darkneſs of Popery will diſappear: it ſeems to be doing ſo gradually; perſecution and the inquiſition, the moſt infernal wickedneſs, are moſtly gone: the Pope has loſt his temporal power and ſupremacy over princes, and is confined to eccleſiaſtic matters; and what is moſt ſtrange, moſt Papiſts now diſdain to be called by his name, which was once their glory, ſo that he will ſoon be reckoned Satan's vicar and vicegerent, and not Chriſt's. They now begin to deny many of their abſurdities, as abſolution, not keeping faith with heretics, *&c.* being aſhamed of them.

We come now to conſider the reformation, and the Proteſtant church, which the church of Rome brands with the odious epithets of hereſy and ſchiſm; *1ſt*, the Proteſtant doctrine, they call a new doctrine, and hereſy, though, as Calvin obſerves, in the dedication of his Inſtitutions to the French King, there is nothing new in it, (but to theſe to whom Chriſt and the goſpel are new,) being the doctrine of Chriſt and his apoſtles; and therefore as the reformers were bringing no new doctrine, but only reſtoring the old

and true one, they needed no extraordinary miſſion or miracles to confirm it; though they may indeed be reckoned evangeliſts, as Calvin obſerves, for the great work they did, of reſtoring the goſpel; which, conſidering the oppoſition they had to ſtruggle with, was an extraordinary work, countenanced and carried on by providence. *2dly*, They brand the ſeparation from their communion with the odious epithet of ſchiſm; and declare, that as the Proteſtants have cut themſelves off from the union and communion of their church, which they hold to be the only Catholic true church, they are like a member cut off from the body, or a branch cut off from the vine, which muſt wither and periſh.

Schiſm, we grant, is a dangerous error, or, as a certain Proteſtant calls it, a damnable ſin. Error in doctrine, or ſuperſtition in worſhip, are but like diſeaſes in the body, but ſchiſm rents, or tears it to pieces, and thus by renting it is the deſtruction of it. That the great apoſtle is of this mind, is clear from his exhortations to unity and forbearance to the Jewiſh and Gentile converts, and particularly from the firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians. The Corinthians had fundamental errors in doctrine, in denying the reſurrection, and groſs immorality in practice; without diſcipline exerciſed, and they alſo aſſociate with idolaters at their feaſts; yet the thing he firſt and principally condemns is ſchiſm, Cor. i. 10. (See Boſton's Sermon on it, ſhewing the evil and danger of ſchiſm.) It is indeed the moſt dangerous thing, as it prevents refor-

mation by deſtruction. For diviſion, in either the church or civil ſociety, is the ready way to its deſtruction; and the political rule of an enemy is, divide, and you'll overcome and deſtroy. A kingdom divided againſt itſelf cannot ſtand. If the parties fight againſt, and devour one another, they ſave that trouble to the common enemy. But the next queſtion to be conſidered is, what ſchiſm is. It is a cauſeleſs ſeparation, or a ſeparation without ſufficient cauſe. A diviſion without a difference in religious matters, or in the conſtitution of a church, viz. in doctrine, worſhip, or church-government, (which however unaccountable, is ſometimes the caſe,) is evidently a total ſchiſm: But a diviſion or ſeparation without a ſufficient cauſe, is alſo a ſchiſm; and what a ſufficient cauſe is, let Turretine, the ſtandard of controverſy among the reformed, determine. He declares, that error in doctrine, groſs corruption, or idolatry in worſhip, and tyranny in church-government, are juſt cauſes of ſeparation; but then he explains what degree of theſe he means, that it is not for a light or leſſer error in doctrine that ſeparation is to be made, but for more deſtructive capital errors, that ſtrike at the heart of ſalvation, and foundation of faith. And for corruption in worſhip, it is not for light ſuperſtition but groſs ſuperſtition, or manifeſt idolatry; and as to corruption in diſcipline, it is not for ſome diſorder, or acts of tyranny, but cruel, oppreſſive tyranny continued in, and intolerable perſecution, both bodily and ſpiritual, that a ſeceſſion is to be made. And he aſſerts, that a perſon ca

not have God for his Father in heaven, that doth not acknowledge the church for his mother on earth; nor can he have union with the head, that deſpiſes and withdraws from communion with the members of the body of Chriſt: and though ſome errors be favoured in a church, if they be not fundamental as to ſaving faith and holineſs; and though there be ſome vain ſuperſtitious rites in her worſhip, if they be tolerable, and do not deprave the conſcience; and though in government, or the adminiſtration of diſcipline, ſome ſin or defect take place, yet we cannot preſently make a ſeparation, without an unjuſt and raſh ſchiſm, *prima diſputatio*, S. 11, 12. And Calamy, another famous reformed Calviniſtic divine, gives it as a rule, to keep communion with all thoſe churches with whom Chriſt keeps communion: if we forſake the communion of a church that Chriſt has not forſaken, he will forſake us. (Preface to his Godly man's ark.)

Shields, another famous Calviniſtic divine, in church-communion, obſerves, that total ſeparation from a church, or a miniſter, is equal to the higheſt church-cenſure; and he alſo obſerves, that there was no warrant to ſeparate from any church mentioned in ſcripture; tho' the Jewiſh church, in our Saviour's days, and thoſe of Corinth, Galatia, and the ſeven churches of Aſia, were very corrupt; and all that was required of the godly, by the prophets, was not to join the idolaters in their corruptions and infections, but to join them in the worſhip of the true God at the temple.

The faults of our fellow-worſhippers cannot hurt us, or having communion with ſinners, if not in ſin; communion in a wrong way, or in a right way on ſinful terms, muſt be interpreted and underſtood by the rules of theſe great authors; what degree of error there is in the way, or in the terms. There are juſt two texts that require ſeparation, 2 Cor. vi. 17. Rev. xviii. 4.; the one is from Heathen idolaters, and the other is from Babylon, or ſomething as bad, as it literally was, for tyranny and idolatry.

Thus I have given all the ſtrength to the argument againſt ſchiſm that it can have, or that the Papiſts can require; as I would always give the adverſaries full juſtice, or every advantage they can juſtly claim a title to; and if my cauſe cannot ſtand its ground, when it gets nothing but ſtrict juſtice, I would give it up as wrong; but every cauſe has a title to a fair hearing, and the greateſt criminal has a title to fair and impartial juſtice. To condemn unheard or unjudged, is the proverbial character of a certain place noted thereby for injuſtice. The next thing to be conſidered is, whether or not the reformation was attended with a ſchiſm by the Proteſtants; for that it was not attended with hereſy is plain, unleſs the Bible, which is the rule of orthodoxy, be reckoned hereſy; for what are called Proteſtant, and more ſtrictly Preſbyterian principles, are to reject every thing in religion that has no foundation in ſcripture. Calvin, who was a great lawyer, and is generally reckoned a ſolid judicious divine, conſidering the evil and danger of ſchiſm, and how it was view

ed by the chief of the fathers, as Jerom, Auguſtin, &c. was ſorely diſtreſſed about ſeparating from the church of Rome, and would not have done it, unleſs he had been driven to this dilemma, that he muſt either do it, or conform to them in all things. Had he been allowed to teach the doctrine, and perform the worſhip that was agreeable to the word of God, and his own conſcience, he would not have ſeparated from it; but that liberty and forbearance, which the apoſtle recommends to the Jewiſh and Gentile converts to exerciſe, and not impoſe any thing on one another, was not to be enjoyed; for he muſt either teach their doctrine and worſhip as they do, with both tranſubſtantiation and the unknown tongue, &c. or he could not remain in their communion; and as the church of Rome had made a ſchiſm from the true doctrine and worſhip of the goſpel, and impoſed her corruptions on all her members, as a term of communion, ſeparation could be made from her without ſchiſm. The authors on this ſubject are almoſt numberleſs; all the reformers wrote on it, and all polemical authors. For a full view of it, ſee Luther, Calvin, the Preſervatives againſt Popery, and Morning exerciſes againſt it, Chillingworth's Religion of Proteſtants, Stillingfleet's Grounds of the Proteſtant Religion, Fowns on Chriſt's three Offices, Pool's Nullity of the Romiſh Faith, Tillotſon's Sermons, Gavin's Maſter-key to Popery, (he was a convert from it,) Owen's chambers of Imagery in the Church of Rome, Turretine, Pictet, &c. &c. On the Popiſh ſide, ſee Bellarmine, their moſt learned, ex-

tenſive, and liberal writer, and who ſtates the arguments comparatively fair; and inſtead of all the above, ſee Ameſius Bellarminus Enervatus, for anſwer to him. But what gives the church of Rome the greateſt advantage againſt Proteſtants is their own diviſions and inteſtine diſcords, with which ſhe upbraids them, as well as with ſeparating from her communion; being diſtracted into endleſs diviſions and parties, that do nothing but perpetually contradict and plague one another. And it is a maxim, that oppoſite parties cannot all be right, but they may all be wrong; they have neither united with the Greek church, which is alſo in oppoſition to Popery, nor maintained union among themſelves. Nothing has ſo much prevented the progreſs of the reformation, as the diviſions and contending parties of Proteſtants, and made ignorant Papiſts ſay of them, as certain Heathen ambaſſadors ſaid of Chriſtians of old, being ſent to inquire of Chriſtians about their religion, and finding them contending and diſputing with one another, they returned and ſaid, that the Chriſtians were not agreed among themſelves what their religion was. It cannot be denied that this is a ſcandal to Proteſtants; it ſtumbles the ſerious and well-meaning, confirms the bad in ſcoffing at religion, and deſtroys the weak, Rom. xiv. 15.

We cannot diſſemble the ſorrow here which we expreſſed at the firſt view of the contentions and diviſions that aroſe among Chriſtians, viz. between the Jewiſh and Gentile converts; but yet, upon a ſtrict ſurvey of the matter, we will find, that Papiſts totally miſrepreſent Proteſtant

here; for the different parties of Proteſtants are not oppoſite or contrary to one another, as they alledge, at leaſt they all agree in oppoſition to the Pope. Luther and Calvin agreed in forty points, and differed but in one. They all agree in doctrine, for their articles, creeds, confeſſions, &c. are all for ſubſtance the ſame; and this is a great matter, that they agree in the articles of faith, and rules of practice. But an objection ariſes here, Why do they uſe any other ſtandard or rule of doctrine than the ſcriptures, when they condemn the church of Rome for making the church, and her canons, and decrees, as the articles of the council of Trent a rule? If they make human compoſitions and authorities a ſtandard, becauſe the church approves and eſtabliſhes them, or compoſes them, is not this making the church, and not the ſcriptures, the rule? which is the very thing they condemn in the church of Rome, as being the ſum and ſubſtance of the difference between them.

I have neither time nor inclination at preſent to diſcuſs this ſubject, and yet I cannot paſs it without ſaying a few things. It is argued in favour of confeſſions, that they are the only way to prevent hereſy creeping into the church, for heretics interpret the ſcriptures as they pleaſe: but here they are bound to a certain ſet of articles; and it is argued, that though the fathers might have deſired the perſecutors, who accuſed the Chriſtians of principles dangerous to ſociety, to look into the ſcriptures, or the New Teſtament, and ſee their principles, yet they rather choſed to ſend out apologies expreſſed in their

own words, as being more compendious and explicit. But the chief argument in favours of confeſſions, creeds, and apologies, is this; That there are many phantaſtic ſects of Chriſtians, of old and of late, who pretend to make the Bible their rule, as well as the rational and orthodox; and the only way that the latter can exhibit to the world that they are not like theſe, or that all Chriſtians are not fanatics, or Antinomians, is by publiſhing a ſum of their doctrines of faith, and rules of practice; and thus the principles of rational Chriſtians are not only known to the world, to diſtinguiſh them and the Chriſtian name from fanatics, but the principles of particular churches or communions are thus known to others, to ſee wherein they agree with them. The arguments on the oppoſite ſide are theſe: That making human compoſitions and ſyſtems ſtandards and canons, or rules of faith, to be ſubſcribed and ſworn to, is certainly making the church infallible, which is the very error of the church of Rome: and Proteſtants involve themſelves in a contradiction here, and a circle worſe than that of the church of Rome; for they hold, that all men, and all churches and councils, are fallible, and yet they declare that their confeſſions are without error; now, upon their own principles, there muſt be errors in them, tho' they do not ſee them. But, to be ſhort, it were certainly better to collect the ſum of their articles of faith and rules of practice from the ſcriptures, and intimate in the preface that they take theſe juſt as they are expreſſed, according to the fifth rule of interpretation. The worthy Mr

Warden has compiled the beſt confeſſion that ever the world ſaw, viz. his ſcripture ſyſtem of divinity, in which he equally diſplays genius and judgment: but if they think that the expreſſions of the church, or of uninſpired men, are more explicit and proper than ſcripture-expreſſions, then this is granting what the Deiſts contend for. It is reckoned the greateſt blunder ever was made in any age of the church, to make human compoſitions rules of faith, or ſtandards of doctrine, &c. Were there nothing ſuch as theſe, there would be nothing but one Chriſtian church; but theſe are the partition walls that divide it into different departments; and not only every eſtabliſhed church, but every little ſect erects one of theſe, or adds it to former ones, and lay more ſtreſs on theſe than the book of God. Thus the Tridentine articles make the church of Rome, the liturgy rubrick, &c. make that of England, the Weſt confeſſion makes that of Scotland, &c.

A certain ſerious Chriſtian, who determined to read no human writing, far leſs ſubſcribe or ſwear to them, having a child to be baptized, deſired a paſtor of one party to do it; he aſked him if he agreed to his articles? he told him, he knew nothing about them; why then he could not get his child baptized. He tried another, and the event was the ſame; as the good man told them he knew none of their terms of communion, as he read no book but the Bible, nor would he qualify to any of their communions but to the Bible only: and tho' they all owned he knew the ſcriptures, and was a ſincere Chriſtian, yet none of them could give him church-

privileges on their own terms. Thus true Chriſtians that belong to the alone church of Chriſt, are ſhut out of all churches and communions of human eſtabliſhment. A certain church indeed requires only every one's confeſſion at admiſſion in their own words, and compares it with the ſcriptures, to ſee if it is agreeable to them. And a certain party, that admit none into their communion who are not of the Weſt confeſſion principles, yet account it ſacrilege, or profane ſuperſtition, to ſubſcribe any human compoſition. In a word, human writings may be uſeful to read, but they are hurtful when made ſtandards of doctrine, articles of faith, or rules of conſcience or conduct. Yet, after all, there may be a political expediency for this according to the circumſtances of certain times. Whoever would ſee a full account of this ſubject may read Dunlop's preface to the collection of Confeſſions, and a book called the Confeſſional. But to return to the prior point: The Proteſtant churches agree in rejecting traditions and the Apocrypha.

2*dly*, They agree in worſhip, as to the object of it, and only have ſome circumſtantial differences in the mode of performing it; they all own but one Mediator, and two ſacraments. Their chief difference is in church-government, which is more an external and political eccleſiaſtic difference; not ſo much affecting the laity, and the doctrine, and the worſhip they attend. We ſhall conſider, 1*ſt*, the different eſtabliſhments, and then the different parties that diſſent from them. The reformed churches are gene-

rally distinguished into Lutheran and Calvinist, so called from these two great heads of the reformation; only the established church of England cannot be wholly reduced to either of them; she is Calvinistic in her doctrine, she is partly Lutheran in her church-government; but far more hierarchical, and she is partly Lutheran and Calvinistic in her worship; but also far exceeds them in attachment to forms, &c. The church of Scotland is Calvinistic in her doctrine and church-government, and was formerly so in her worship, viz. in the first period of the reformation, and is yet partly so. It is observed, that all the reformed churches, both at home and abroad, have a liturgy, or form of public prayers, administration of the sacraments, &c. but Scotland; and she had one in the first period of the reformation, which goes yet by the name of John Knox's liturgy, the great Scots reformer; but none of them arbitrarily imposed a liturgy to be universally and constantly used but England; but left it to the discretion and choice of pastors to use it at pleasure, as they found it expedient for them. To have such a form of public worship and divine service is useful for beginners at least, to see the daily course and order, if they have not occasion to use it. Scotland indeed has a pretty large directory; but to impose a liturgy to be constantly used by all, to the neglect of using their own gifts for the edification of themselves and others, is contrary to the design of divine worship, and checking the progress of devotion.

We shall consider the arguments for and against the use of forms, but it must be previously ob-

ſerved, that it is only with regard to ſocial wor-
ſhip that this contraſt takes place: as for indi-
vidual perſons, in their private or ſecret devo-
tions, if they are not ſenſible what are their
mercies they ſhould give thanks for, what are
their wants they need to aſk the ſupply of, and
what their ſins are they need to implore the
pardon of, and what the evils are to which
they are moſt incident; or, in the apoſtle's
words, what are the ſins that moſt eaſily be-
ſet them, and the temptations, ſnares, and dan-
gers, to which from their ſituation they are moſt
expoſed, they muſt be void of underſtanding,
and cannot be conſidered as rational thinking
beings. Mental prayer, or the devotion of the
heart, conſiſts in a conſtant ſenſe of mercies,
wants, ſins, dangers, &c. and is a continual pray-
er. No ſet forms can anſwer the progreſs of
chriſtian experience, difference of circumſtances
and events of providence, either with regard to
perſonal devotion, or ſocial worſhip; therefore a
devout heart is the beſt monitor: and one of the
fathers informs us, that the primitive chriſtians
and churches had no other monitor but their
hearts. I know it is argued, that prayer is need-
leſs, as it cannot move God to alter his purpoſe,
to do what he did not deſign, nor can we give
him any information. To this it is anſwered,
that the chief deſign of prayer is not to influ-
ence God, but ourſelves. Giving thanks for
our mercies is expreſſing our ſenſe of them, ſo
as to impreſs that ſenſe of gratitude on our own
minds, to make us live ſuitably. Aſking the
ſupply of our wants, tends to impreſs on our

minds a ſenſe of our dependence on the goodneſs of God, truſt in him, and reſignation to his will. Confeſſing our ſins, tends to impreſs our minds with a ſenſe of the evil and danger of them, ſo as to guard us againſt ſin, and to make us fit objects for pardon. More particularly when we pray, Our Father, &c. it tends to impreſs our minds with a ſenſe of the love, compaſſion, and goodneſs of God, and with confidence in him as a father, and alſo with benevolence to others, as children of the ſame father to promote their welfare, and with veneration for his Majeſty and greatneſs, as in heaven. When we ſay, Hallowed be thy name, thy kingdom come, thy will be done, we do not mean to put God in mind of the affairs of his glory and kingdom, or of doing what pleaſes him, or that he will alter his purpoſe, &c. but we mean to impreſs our minds with a ſenſe of his holineſs, to engage us to be holy, and to promote the intereſts of his kingdom by diligence in duty, and patience in tribulation, &c. When we pray for the fall of antichriſt, and Satan's kingdom, we mean to impreſs ourſelves with a ſenſe of the evil and danger of them, ſo as to guard us againſt them. When we pray, Give us our daily bread, we mean not to be fed by miracles, but to excite ourſelves to a diligent uſe of the means of ſubſiſtence in purſuing buſineſs, with a dependence on the divine bleſſing and favour; and that we depend on his goodneſs. When we pray, Forgive, &c. we mean to impreſs our minds with a ſenſe of the evil of ſin, ſo as to repent of it, and abſtain from it, and forgive thoſe that have treſpaſſed againſt us

when they repent, and thereby render ourſelves the fitter objects of the divine forgiveneſs. When we pray, Lead us not into temptation, we mean to impreſs our minds with a ſenſe of watchfulneſs againſt all opportunities and temptations to ſin. When we ſay, Thine is the kingdom, we mean not to give God information, but to impreſs our minds with a ſenſe of God's all-ſufficiency, omnipotence, and excellence, to engage our minds to truſt, reverence, and obedience, &c.

From this rational view of the deſign of prayer, it appears how contradictory and abſurd their conduct is, who pray and do not endeavour, or perhaps do not intend to act conſiſtently with their prayers; who pray, Lead us not into temptation, and yet run into it; who pray for pardon of the ſin they do not intend to forſake; who ſpeak or pray to this purpoſe, Forgive me this ſin, but I nevertheleſs deſign to repeat it firſt opportunity—forgive me my treſpaſſes as I forgive, &c. *i. e.* pour out vengeance on me, for I wiſh to do that on my enemies.

Three things concur to form prayer aright.

1*ſt*, The gift or the capacity of thinking, and expreſſing one's ſelf.

2*dly*, The grace, or a ſenſe of the things prayed for, as gratitude for mercies we give thanks for, and ſorrow for ſins confeſſed, &c.; or if this be called the proper affection or diſpoſition, it is to the ſame purpoſe.

3*dly*, The ſpirit of prayer, or ſupernatural aid, and the divine influence from the hearer and object of prayer, as an evidence of acceptance in duty.

The divine influence only can excite our affections to pray aright, (the Heathens were ſenſible of this,) and theſe prayers that are performed by his influence or dictates, will be anſwered; it is an evidence or pledge of the return of ſuch requeſts. There is this difference betwixt perſonal and ſocial prayer; that in the firſt one attends particularly to his own private circumſtances and caſe; but in ſocial prayer, the one who is the mouth, or ſpeaker, muſt conſider and attend to the general circumſtances of the reſt, that is of mankind, and adapt himſelf thereto; and not to his own particular circumſtances in extempore prayer.

Though this kind of prayer is more animating than the other, yet it has its diſadvantages; the ſpeaker may ſometimes be more attentive to invent what may entertain the hearers, than intent on true devotion himſelf; and the hearers not ſo much intent on true devotion, as waiting with curioſity to hear what comes next, expecting to be entertained with it; and therefore are more fitly ſaid to be hearing, than praying, or united in heart, offering up their joint deſires; accompanying the one called the mouth with the deſires he expreſſes, or conſenting with the heart to what he expreſſes with the mouth.

The Jews called the miniſter of the ſynagogue the angel of the people, when preſenting their requeſts in prayer to God; and the angel of God to the people in bringing his meſſage to them when preaching; prayer was therefore held to be the moſt ſacred ſolemn part of worſhip, being an immediate addreſs to God, and the ex-

ercise of communion with him; a great divine calls it the breathing of a Christian, or of one born again; the flight of the soul ascending to the presence of God on the wings of faith and love; strong desires, and devout affections; the key of Paradise, or if that epithet belongs properly to Christ, the key of his treasures; the prayer performed in the exercise of the faith of the operation of his Spirit obtains all its requests, as they are dictated by the Spirit. Forms of prayer have their advantages, as being known before; all consists in composing the mind to perform them devoutly, or offer them up in sincerity. But the same form always repeated, besides not suiting new circumstances, become cold and languid. Though children in years or understanding should use forms, rather than pour forth indecent expressions, or use uncouth metaphors in social prayer, that may disturb the devotion of others. Metaphors indeed naturally and unavoidably introduce themselves into our language, and mix with our discourse; but they should be natural and easy in religious exercises. Dr Watts's little treatise on prayer, which is without forms, is the best prayer book yet published, and should be perused by every one.

Prayer is the principal means for improving the mind in dispositions meet for a better world. But to return to the former point,

The churches of England and Scotland have gone both to extremes; the one in enjoining the constant use of their liturgy and forms by act of uniformity, and swearing it is agreeable

the word of God, which no body can do that has ſeen both; and the other, in totally rejecting what might be otherwiſe uſeful, and foreign churches are a medium between them. The church of England indeed allows one extempore prayer each day, but it is either ſhort or ſeldom uſed, and often written and read, and often only for the Biſhop, the Lord of the dioceſe. The other differences among Proteſtant eſtabliſhed churches are in ceremonies of worſhip, &c. and church-government. Some Proteſtant churches, particularly the Engliſh, uſe ceremonies in worſhip which others think relicks of Popery, not reformed or purged out; and contrary to the purity and ſpiritual ſimplicity of Chriſtian worſhip; as muſical inſtruments in praiſing God, which was the Jewiſh mode, and was ſymbolical and emblematical of the internal melody of the heart, as their purifications were of internal purity; and not ſuitable to the evangelical ſtate, nor authoriſed in the New Teſtament, or by the example of the apoſtles and the primitive church: under the ſame argument fall reſponſes, parts of muſic, &c. which are external pomp, contrary to the purity and ſimplicity of the goſpel-worſhip, which requires only one part of muſic for uniſon or uniformity. Another difference is about holy days, chiefly uſed in the Engliſh church, as the feaſts and faſts of the church, ſaints days, lent, vigils, &c. Charles Owen, in his addreſs to the moderate ſons of the church of England, enumerates theſe holy days, and finds, that they occupy juſt the half of the work days, that is three days *per*

week, one time with another in the year. Now there is neither precept nor example for obſerving any days but the firſt day of the week, Acts xx. 7. 1 Cor. xvi. 2. Rev. i. 10.; and the apoſtle condemns the obſervation of ſuch as Jewiſh, Gal. iv. Col. ii. 16.; and it is found, that theſe days juſtle out the right obſervation of the Lord's day; as in Rome, only canonical hours are kept holy, and in England, only the hours of public worſhip; and the book of ſports was a ſhame to a Chriſtian land. If they deſiſt from their ordinary callings, they do much worſe, as they make it a day of ſports, games, diverſions, ſettling accounts, viſiting, &c.; whereby it is rather devoted to the devil than God, and more wickedneſs done on it than all the week.

The Sabbath is the ſum of religion, and theſe that obſerve it not, may, without breach of charity, be ſaid to have none. The rule is, to do nothing on it that can be done before, or delayed till after, except works of piety, charity, mercy, and neceſſity, Iſa. lviii. 13. See Williſon on the ſanctification of it. It is juſt and reaſonable that we devote a part of our time to the author of all our time for his honour and worſhip, and not rob him of the day he has choſen; and that we alſo occupy a part of our time more particularly in improving our minds for a better ſtate as no work can be done without time to do it in. The argument for the addition of holy days is that they were appointed for promoting religion as weekly ſermons would not be ſufficient to ſupport it; but the Author of religion, and head of the church, ſurely knew beſt what was need

ful to ſupport religion, and this is pretending to be wiſer than he.

The ſubſtituting godfathers and godmothers in baptiſm in place of parents is complained of as robbing them of their natural right, and removing the charge from them to whom nature has committed it, and entruſting it to ſtrangers; and leading them to make vows, and come under obligations, that many of them cannot perform. Were theſe only taken as ſureties for the parents performing their duty it were well, but putting them in place of parents is equally contrary to reaſon, nature, and the goſpel. Uſing the ſign of the croſs in baptiſm is alſo conſidered as a popiſh ceremony, there being no word of it in the inſtitution; and kneeling at the Lord's ſupper looks like worſhipping the elements, and ſo believing tranſubſtantiation, like the Papiſts. Chriſt and his apoſtles received it in their uſual table-poſture; but as it is allowed to be a ſolemn act of worſhip, kneeling being the moſt humble poſture, ſuits it beſt on that account, or ſtanding, which is alſo a reverential poſture. Bowing or kneeling at the name Jeſus is ſcrupled at alſo, as they do it not at the name Chriſt, or any other of the divine names; it ſeems therefore ſuperſtitious, and they can give no reaſon for it.

Reading ſome Apocryphal books in the church, as is done in England, and not owning them as inſpired, is more inconſiſtent than the practice of Papiſts. Confirmation, as it is uſed in the church of England, is alſo objected to as ſuperſtitious; but the ſuperſtition of it lies in the manner of its performance. But the Lord's

ſupper is the beſt confirmation, as Calvin obſerves. Uſing the ring in marriage is alſo objected to, as a ridiculous ceremony in the church of England; the conſent of parties being that which conſtitutes marriage. In ſhort, it is evident to any that will compare them, that the Engliſh prayer-book was collected out of the Popiſh maſs-book, leaving out the idolatry, and retaining the ſuperſtition, which was deſigned to entice Papiſts, but did not ſerve the end; as the church of Rome's retaining Pagan ſuperſtitions was deſigned to entice others, and pleaſe them that were already proſelyted. It was not the having a liturgy and forms that gave cauſe to diſſenting, but the abſurdity of retaining Popiſh ones. Many of them are ſo abſurd and ridiculous, that it is wonderful they are not aſhamed of uſing them. There was indeed a propoſal for reforming, or amending the liturgy: it is alſo defective. The litany has the air of blaſphemy, and cannot fail to ſhock any rational pious ear that was not bred up with it; ſo that it be natural and reconciled by cuſtom, which ſanctifies the greateſt abſurdities. The funeral ſervice, which depoſites all in ſure and certain hopes of a bleſſed reſurrection, is impious. This is an eaſier way for a bad man to get to heaven than by penance and purgatory, *&c.* in the church of Rome; and it moſt uncharitably claſſes unbaptized children with ſelf-murderers and excommunicate perſons. The form of abſolution is groſs, and has the air of popery. The prayers of the church are ſhort, abrupt, and incomplete. Thoſe of the primitive church were long and entire; but their's are broken

into parcels for the ſeveral things; toſs'd between the prieſt and the clerk, and, as if they had forgot ſomething, they go back again. They are rather like graces, having little more than a preface and a concluſion, ſtill repeated, which is indecent. But they are now falling off from their ceremonies, *&c.* as they obſerve few holidays for public ſervice but Chriſtmas and Eaſter; and there is a general prejudice againſt godfathers, *&c.* in baptiſm, ſo that primitive ſimplicity is gaining ground.

The church of Scotland ran to the other extreme, in rejecting what was abuſed by others, as a liturgy and a funeral ſervice, &c. All nations had funeral ſolemnities, which indicated their belief of the immortality of the ſoul, and of a future ſtate of happineſs and miſery; and Chriſtians thereby indicated alſo their belief of the reſurrection of the body. It is a ſolemn ſtriking ſcene, and a fit ſeaſon to impreſs people with a ſenſe of death and eternity, and of the neceſſity of a proper preparation for it. And it is the practice of that very church to employ fit ſeaſons, as of affliction or ſickneſs, for inſtruction, when mankind will be diſpoſed to liſten to it. But becauſe the church of Rome prays for the dead, they rejected the proper ſolemnities at the burial of them; and alſo the doxology, becauſe it is ſuperſtitiouſly uſed by the church of Rome, though it is the very characteriſtic and mark of Chriſtian praiſe, and was uſed by all Chriſtians from the commencement of Chriſtianity. The objecting to it as a form is equally againſt the bleſſing, and likewiſe the uſual con-

cluſion of all prayers, to which the doxology is exactly parallel, as the concluſion of praiſe.

Another great defect, impropriety, and abſurdity, in ſome reformed churches, as theſe of Scotland and England, *&c.* is uſing Jewiſh pſalmody, which is conforming to the Jews in praiſe. If the New Teſtament, which contains the goſpel clearly, is more excellent to read than the Old, which contains it only vailed under types, figures, &c. it is ſurely more excellent to ſing. The book of Pſalms is only a part of the Old Teſtament put into verſe, and ſuits only moral and devotional ſubjects, but not evangelical ones, and does not ſuit the Chriſtian church; it is going back under the vail of the Old Teſtament, and not ſuitable praiſe to be ſung by Chriſtians. The paſtors of the primitive church often compoſed hymns ſuitable to the ſubjects and occaſions; and if individuals have the choice of the words uſed in extempore prayers, why not alſo the direction of the praiſe, and the words to be uſed in it? As the prayer after the diſcourſe is agreeable to the ſubject of diſcourſe, ſo ſhould the praiſe be for uniformity and propriety at leaſt: but this cannot be the caſe without putting the greater part of the Bible into verſe, or elſe compoſing hymns on all divine ſubjects. This is excellently done by ſome ingenious pious authors, particularly Dr Watts. The church of Scotland has appointed a very ſcanty number of hymns, moſtly ſelected from him, as an addition to her pſalmody, and not one among them for baptiſm, and ſome other ordinances and occaſions. It is very ſtrange, that ſhe has

not rather adopted the whole of his hymns, or pſalmody. There are alſo four goſpel-verſions of the Pſalms, of which Dr Watts is the beſt, which are ſo well imitated in the language of the New Teſtament, as to ſuit the Chriſtian ſtate, according to the apoſtle's key, Acts iv. 25. Heb. ii. 6.

Theſe and his hymns are uſed by the Diſſenting church of England, which was the bulwark of the reformation, and is the moſt learned reſpectable part of the reformed church, the church of Geneva and the late reformed church in France not excepted. The Weſtminſter aſſembly, that moſt auguſt council ſince the apoſtolic ſynod, conſiſted of Engliſh Preſbyterians, and is the fountain of the preſent conſtitution of the church of Scotland; but ſhe has been backward to follow the example of her mother in this eſſential piece of reformation, and has totally neglected the doxology: and the Scots Diſſenters keenly oppoſe all ſuch reformation, and rivet the people in their prejudices againſt it, in order to gratify their humours; as mankind are violently attached to antiquity, though they are as fond of novelty, where it does not interfere with antiquity. The preſent verſion uſed in Scotland was made by Rouſe, an Engliſh diſſenter, and was introduced in 1650, as being better than the one then uſed; though it is one of the worſt, as it never illuſtrates, but often obſcures the ſubject. And Papiſts juſtly obſerve, that ſinging many parts of the Pſalms, and reading many parts of ſcripture in the church, (as in theſe churches where the Bible is read yearly) which the peo-

ple do not underſtand, is no better than their unknown tongue.

Another great impropriety uſed in moſt places in Scotland is reading the line; this, it ſeems, was introduced by Popery. When the people were not allowed the uſe of their Bibles, they ſaid to the prieſts, How ſhall we do at church? we cannot ſing wanting our books! The prieſts replied, We will read the line to you. But now, when the reformation has reſtored the uſe of the Bibles, the reading the line ſhould be laid aſide as a relic of Popery; as it greatly interrupts and mars the harmony in ſinging, and the exerciſe of devotion, and gives opportunity to people to gaze at thoſe coming in, or at any object; which is alſo occaſioned by extempore prayer, when they have not to look at their book; and a wandering eye indicates a wandering heart. It is perfectly abſurd to read the line to thoſe that can read it themſelves, and have it before them.

Another indecent improper thing uſed in Scotland is ſitting when they ſing, as if ſinging were no part of divine worſhip that required a reverential poſture. The voice has much more freedom to ſing in ſtanding than ſitting. It is ſtrange this piece of reformation has not taken place, that they may ſing as other churches do. Not long ago they ſat in ſome places in time of prayer. Kneeling is indeed the moſt humble poſture for prayer, but ſtanding before one that is reverenced is alſo decent.

Having conſidered the doctrine and worſhip of the reformed churches, we proceed next to

conſider church-government, which is the greateſt ſubject of diſpute. (As for the ſurplice, and other parts of epiſcopal dreſs, ſome of them are remarked as ridiculous and ſuperſtitious, as the corner'd caps, *&c.* See Charles Owen. But as for the difference of a black or white gown, it is a matter of indifferency; and every office ought to have ſome diſtinguiſhing dreſs, if they mean ſymbols; if black is a ſymbol of penitence, white is a ſymbol of purity.)

The church-government of the reformed churches is of three kinds, Prelatic, Preſbyterian, and Independent. Under the firſt, the churches are called Dioceſan, under the ſecond, National, under the third, Congregational. In the two laſt, there is a parity, or co-equality among the paſtors as to power and authority, and pretty much ſo as to labours and benefices. In the firſt there is a ſubordination, or ſuperiority and inferiority as to power, and a very great inequality as to labours and revenues; the great revenues belonging to thoſe who have great power, and labour little. The queſtion is, Which of theſe is the Chriſtian form of church-government, or the New Teſtament-plan? for there can be no model drawn from the Old Teſtament, though ſome, both of Papiſts and Prelatiſts, pretend otherwiſe; and indeed each of them find their own mode in it; the firſt, by making the High Prieſt anſwer to the Pope, and the other prieſts and levites to the inferior clergy; and the ſecond, in making the High Prieſt anſwer to the Biſhop, the other prieſts to their prieſts, and the levites to the deacons. But then this

order was not moral, but typical, and ceremonial, as alſo their dreſs and actions were; and in alluſion thereto Chriſt is called our great High Prieſt; for the high prieſt, his robes, the temple, altar, ſacrifices, and the whole of that ſervice, was typical of Chriſt and the goſpel, as was obſerved before; the ſynagogue was moral, and anſwers to the Chriſtian church. The queſtion then is, Which of theſe forms of church-government can moſtly be deduced from the New Teſtament? A certain dignified clergyman, of a neighbouring church and nation ſaid, he did not ſee that any form of church-government, that is in the world at preſent, could be wholly deduced from the New Teſtament; and though he was a member of that church, he would not ſay it was the beſt one, and one of a different church and nation ſaid the ſame.

Before the middle of the ſecond century every church was a little ſtate, governed by its own preſident and college of Preſbyters; and different churches were united by no tie but that of brotherly affection, communion, and correſpondence with one another, in the fellowſhip of the goſpel; having the ſame ordinances, doctrine, and worſhip; one Lord, one faith, one baptiſm, &c. and maintained a unity of ſpirit in the bond of peace; and when any matter of public or general concern required a deliberation, a public convention of the whole church conveened and decided it, as in the Apoſtolic council at Jeruſalem. This was the caſe till about the middle of the ſecond century, when provincial churches began to be formed, and

then the whole face of the Chriſtian church aſ-ſumed a new aſpect.

Provincial churches, conſiſting of a number of individual or congregational ones, whoſe church-officers aſſembled in claſſical ſynods or meetings, and thus formed a public body, began firſt among the Greeks, and ſoon became univerſal; and the preſident of a provincial church was called Patriarch, &c. See a demonſtration of the Chriſtian form of church-government, from the New Teſtament, and the Apoſtolic and primitive church, entitled the Divine Inſtitution of Biſhops, having Churches, conſiſting of many Congregations, examined by Scripture, by Alexander Lauder miniſter at Mordentown; in which he collects all the places where church is mentioned, and ſhews that it either means the univerſal church, or a particular congregation; for he proves from the Acts, Epiſtles, and antiquity, that the church of Jeruſalem met in one place, notwithſtanding the great number of Chriſtians there mentioned; as did alſo the Chriſtians in all other places, as Corinth, Rome, &c. The 3000 and 5000 converts at Jeruſalem were moſtly ſtrangers occaſionally met there, and not reſidenters. It is ſaid the Proteſtant church of Rowen in France had 25,000, and that of Charenton 50,000 members; and Baxter ſays, the pariſh in which he was born had 60,000 perſons in it; and he ſays, he preached to 6000, who all heard him. And to what great multitudes of the people and military did the Grecian and Roman orators and commanders harangue. Theſe ſcripture churches had all the full power

of diſcipline and juriſdiction within themſelves and managed their own affairs by the parochial Preſbytery, and were congregational churches, independent on each other; but they were parts of the univerſal church, and dependent on it, in what concerned the whole church, as the important difference that took place between the Jewiſh and Gentile converts, Acts xv. And the paſtors were dependent on councils; they ſeemed to differ from modern independency chiefly in this, that thoſe of one congregation cannot have communion with another, but muſt be diſmembered from the former if change of reſidence require them to be in communion with another, and receive the ſacraments, &c. ordinances, as members of it; ſo that their congregations are not parts of the whole body, but each is a whole or univerſal.

The fact is, that diſſenters, as the primitive Chriſtians were, are naturally independents, and though the Scots ones may pretend otherwiſe yet it is impoſſible; for they may depoſe one of their number from the office, yet his congregation can keep him, as has been the caſe in ſome inſtances, and ſhew that they have no power over them, and can do no more than cut off their paſtor from the claſs or preſbytery; but when one is caſt out of an eſtabliſhed church, he is not only cut off from being a member of the claſs, but his congregation can neither give him the church to preach to them in, nor the benefice.

As for modern independents, that call themſelves ſuch, the power they exerciſe ſo far, as

is authoritative, is only congregational; as they hold that every congregation is a compleat independent church, having full power of diſcipline, as well as of diſpenſing the word and ſacraments, lodged in itſelf; and all other power is only conſultative, for they conſult with one another, and hold councils for that purpoſe. Here they ſeem to be too limited in their juriſdiction; for the apoſtolic ſynod at Jeruſalem exerciſed a juriſdiction, power, and authority over all the church; but what is moſt illiberal in their plan is, that the members of one congregation cannot receive the ſacraments in another, till they be cut off from the former, and join the other. Now it is certainly proper, that all chriſtians on earth join together in the celebration of the ordinances, if they could all aſſemble in one body, as they have but one Lord, one baptiſm, &c. Eph. iv. 4. Nay, it is proper that all the world ſhould join together, to worſhip their one Creator, as children of the ſame Father and family, and hold communion and fellowſhip with one another: Only to preſerve order, every congregation, or flock, that is, as many as can conveniently aſſemble together, muſt receive the ordinances from their own paſtor, to avoid the confuſion that might enſue by wandering from one congregation to another; or, in caſe of his inability at the time, they ſhould receive a petition from him to another, for every ſteward ſhould ſupply his own houſehold, that they need not to go from their own to others to ſeek ſupply. Thus far independency muſt take place. The great Dr Owen, who was a moderate independent,

and loved the preſbyterians as brethren, ſaw no foundation for national churches more than for dioceſan ones, in the New Teſtament, though he ſaw foundation for equality among paſtors. The queſtion indeed is, What are the boundaries of a dioceſan, or of a national church? If the extent of the one be a county or province, and that of the other an iſland, or continent, or ſtate, under the ſame civil government, Scotland, Switzerland, and Holland, &c. are national churches; but Campvere in Holland was made a part of the church of Scotland, though beyond the ſeas.

We ſhall examine the New Teſtament, in order to ſee whether the equality, or ſubordination of paſtors, be the chriſtian form of church-government.

And, in the firſt place, Chriſt choſe twelve diſciples, whom he called Apoſtles, whom he veſted with the ſame power and authority, and to whom he gave the ſame commiſſion, both when he ſent them firſt out to teach, and work miracles for a time, and alſo when he gave them an unlimited charge after his reſurrection. He choſe alſo ſeventy diſciples, and ſent them out, as he did the apoſtles at firſt, veſted with the ſame power; they were not commiſſioned by the apoſtles as being ſubject to them, but had their commiſſion immediately from Chriſt himſelf; but their office ſeems only to have been temporary, and wholly to have ceaſed with their firſt commiſſion; and had not the apoſtles commiſſion been renewed after his reſurrection, it had alſo ceaſed as the ſeventy diſciples did, for they had

the ſame power and authority to teach and work miracles; the ſeventy were perhaps the ſeminary of church-officers afterwards. Thus we ſee no foundation for inequality in the evangeliſts.

We proceed next to conſider the Acts and Epiſtles; and in examining of them we muſt conſider what orders of church-officers were extraordinary and peculiar to the apoſtolic age, and what were ordinary and perpetual. We have an account of the different orders in Eph. iv. 11. The three firſt orders were extraordinary, and peculiar to the apoſtolic age. The apoſtles, &c. had no ſucceſſors in the extraordinary parts of their office, as in working miracles, &c. and in the ordinary parts of it every paſtor and teacher is their ſucceſſor. The apoſtles had an immediate call from Chriſt; Matthias and Paul were choſen, or called, after his aſcenſion. Prophets were infallible interpreters of ſcripture, as well as foretellers of future events, Acts xiii. 1. xviii. 6. There were other evangeliſts beſides the four, two of whom were alſo apoſtles; they were companions to the apoſtles in their travels, and aſſiſtants in their labours, as Philip, Timothy, Titus, Silas, &c. Paſtors and teachers were ordinary church-officers, to continue through all ages of the chriſtian church to the end of the world. Paſtors ſeem to have been theſe that had certain flocks committed to their charge, and teachers theſe that had no fixt charge, but employed their talents in teaching wherever occaſion required. Chriſt ſtrictly forbid the aſpiring after pre-eminency among his diſciples, Luke ix. 46. Mark ix. 35. Math. xx.

25.; and we find the apoſtles acting in parity in one apoſtolical ſynod at Jeruſalem, and Peter ſubject to it, and ſent by it, Acts viii. 14.; and when the apoſtles diſperſed through the world, they ordained paſtors to ſucceed them at Jeruſalem, &c. who acted in parity in a preſbytery, Acts xi. 22. xv. 4. xxi. 18. &c.; and no mention of a prelate over them, or any authority of that kind; and in the ſynod of apoſtolic preſbyters and brethren, Acts xv. we find the preſbyters acting in parity with the apoſtles, for a patern to future judicatories that were to ſucceed to the ordinary parts of the apoſtles office, as diſcipline, government, and juriſdiction, in which they were ſucceeded by all biſhops, paſtors, and preſbyters; theſe three names in ſcripture being different titles of the ſame office, and the preſbyter being the higheſt ſtanding office in the church, in which office every true paſtor is the apoſtles ſucceſſor, in confirmation of which both Peter and John, in their epiſtles call themſelves preſbyters. Biſhop denotes overſight, as a watchman; paſtor, feeding, *i. e.* teaching, and government; preſbyter or elder, age and gravity, as an example, all different qualifications of one and the ſame office.

The church of Antioch, where the diſciples were firſt dignified with the name of chriſtians, was the next famous one to that of Jeruſalem; it had ſeveral paſtors and teachers, and no prelate; but they acted in parity, Acts xi. 29. xv. 2. xvi. 4. where we ſtill find a plurality of paſtors acting in equality. Paul and Barnabas ordained preſbyters in every church, (and Titus in every

city in Crete,) Acts .xiv. 23. Tit. i. 5. *i. e.* a competent member, forming a claſs, and acting in parity without a prelate.

Again, Paul and Silas planted a church at the city of Philippi, Acts xvi. and ordained ſeveral preſbyters, or biſhops, to feed and govern it, to whom Paul writes conjunctly, Phil. i. 1. and aſcribes to none more power than the reſt. They were ſurely parochial, or congregational, and not dioceſan biſhops, as there can be but one of the latter in a city; nor can there be a collegiacy of them, as that would be an equality oppoſite to prelacy, and it was but a ſmall city, ſubject to the province of Theſſalonica; had there been any other order of church-officers, he ſurely would not have made ſo great an omiſſion as not to addreſs and admoniſh them.

In Acts xviii. we find Paul founded a church at Corinth, that famous city; ſee the government he inſtituted in it, 1 Cor. v.; where he ſpeaks not to any ſingle man, or biſhop, to cenſure the inceſtuous perſon, but to the rulers, in the plural number; whence it is plain they acted in parity, and had no prelate.

In Acts xx. we find a famous church is planted at Epheſus by Paul, in which we find a company of preſbyters, or biſhops, feeding and governing in equality. Paul, in his laſt and farewell charge to them, calls them ſometimes elders, and ſometimes biſhops, or overſeers, and commits the whole charge of the flock in doctrine and diſcipline to them in parity, Acts xx. 17,—28. when leaving them, never to ſee their faces more; ſo in his laſt direction anent church-go-

vernment, he gives them an equal commiſſion, power, and authority. *N. B.* This was done in Timothy's preſence, whom prelatiſts make biſhop of Epheſus, without a word of his power over them, or of their duty in ſubjection and obedience to him. Would Paul have called the preſbyters biſhops before their biſhop's face, and committed the whole charge of the flock to them as biſhops, in his laſt charge, without the leaſt hint of the relation between them and their biſhop? The fact is, that Timothy and Titus were not biſhops of any fixed dioceſe, but itinerant evangeliſts, as we find them ſtill on journies, and never returning to Epheſus or Crete, Rom. xvi. 21. 1 Cor. xvi. 10. 2 Cor. i. 1, 19. Pſal. ii. 19. 1 Theſſ. iii. 2. Heb. xiii. 23. 2 Cor. vii. 6. viii. 16. Gal. ii. 1. 1 Tim. iv. 10.

Laſtly, We ſee what the government of the Hebrew church was, Heb. xiii. 7, 17, 24.; whence it is clear they had no paſtors, but ſuch as had the care of their ſouls, and laboured among them. *2dly*, That the government belonged to thoſe that were their daily preachers, and watchmen for their ſouls. Nothing can be plainer from ver. 7. than that they who have the key of doctrine have alſo the key of diſcipline and government committed to them, that they who teach ſhould rule the church. Chriſt committed both to all paſtors, Matth. xvi. 19.; and tho' prelates would rob preſbyters of one of them, yet it is plain from God's word, that ruling is as eſſential to their office as teaching, as they are therein called rulers, governors, biſhops, or overſeers, as in Acts v. 12. Heb. xiii. 1 Tim. v. 17.

iv. 14. a preſbytery ordained Timothy. And, further, the powers of juriſdiction belongs to them. See Chriſt's direction, Matth. viii. 15. xvi. 1. where the church's repreſentatives, or rulers, muſt be meant; for it cannot be meant of one man, but a ſociety: the foregoing proofs ſeem to be unanſwerable. It is an empty tale of Bellarmine's, that in the apoſtle's time the names of biſhop and preſbyter were common to both orders, and that the great miſtake of the preſbyterians is to argue from the identity of the names to that of the functions. The whole power, work, and office of biſhops, is devolved upon them; and the community of things is a certain evidence of the identity of offices. They have both the name and power, as is evident from Acts xx. to a demonſtration: and Tit. i. 5, 7. Paul left Titus in Crete to ordain preſbyters in every city; and he ſhews their qualifications. Then, ver. 7. he ſays, A biſhop muſt be blameleſs: this is no reaſon at all; if they are not the ſame, there is no connection between the antecedent and conſequent, for different offices require different talents: the reaſoning would be no leſs ridiculous than that every captain ſhould be able to lead and manage a whole army, becauſe ſuch qualifications are neceſſary in a general.

In 1 Pet. v. the apoſtle not only exhorts to feed, but to do the office of biſhops to the flock, *i. e.* to take the overſight; ſo that preſbyters are not only called biſhops, Acts xx. but commanded to do all thoſe offices to the church that belong to biſhops, as preaching, diſpenſing the

ſacraments, ordaining, exerciſing government, juriſdiction, diſcipline; and what can dioceſan biſhops do more? It is as clear as the noon-day, that God in his word gives preſbyters the whole power and office of biſhops; and prelates ſacrilegiouſly rob them of the one half of it, viz. ordination and juriſdiction, or diſcipline and government, and only leave them the power of diſpenſing the word and ſacraments. It is a new coined diſtinction of ſupreme and ſubordinate preſbyters, that the higher order is the ſame as biſhops, and a mere juggling. What makes any thing of divine right but God's inſtitution? and what evidence can there be of that but ſome text of ſcripture? Paul ſpeaks only of two ſtanding orders, biſhops and deacons, and calls theſe biſhops preſbyters, Phil. i. 1 Tim. v. 17. Preaching the word, and adminiſtring the ſacraments, are greater than ruling and governing, as God's word declares, 1 Tim. v. 17. Dr Hamond, a great prelatiſt, is forced to acknowledge the truth here. If parity be of divine original and inſtitution, then prelacy cannot be ſo, as they are oppoſite and inconſiſtent. The paſtors of the flock are the ſcripture-biſhops, Acts xx. 28. 1 Pet. v. Heb. xiii. 7, 17. 1 Theſſ. v. 12. *i. e.* them that feed and govern the flock, viz. congregational biſhops. Hamond. The Holy Ghoſt's biſhops were ordained in every city and church, Acts xiv. 23. Tit. i. 5, 7. 1 Theſſ. v. 12. They overſee all the flock, and pray with all the ſick, James v. 14. Hamond expounds of biſhops.

Their objections from ſcripture are chiefly three: the *1ſt* is from the twelve apoſtles and

ſeventy diſciples; but this was partly anſwered before: and the learned Mr Sage, their advocate, gives up this, Vindic. princip. Cypr. age, as the ſeventy were not ſtanding officers, but temporary miſſionaries, whoſe commiſſion ſoon expired, and was never renewed, ſo they had no ſucceſſors. The church could not be founded till Chriſt was riſen, as it was founded on his reſurrection; and the twelve's commiſſion had not conſtituted them church-governors, if it had not been renewed after Chriſt's reſurrection. Sage. In what was apoſtolical and extraordinary the apoſtles had no ſucceſſors. While the ſeventy's commiſſion laſted they had the ſame power as the apoſtles: they were not ſubject to them, for they received not their commiſſion from the twelve, as prieſts from biſhops, but immediately from Chriſt, as the twelve did; and they were empowered to do the ſame work as the twelve, and therefore had the ſame power and authority to teach, baptize, and do miracles; and if the ſubject preſbyters were the ſucceſſors of the ſeventy, they could not have power to diſpenſe the Lord's ſupper, as that was not given to the ſeventy.

Their ſecond objection is drawn from Timothy and Titus pretended prelacy in Epheſus and Crete, exerciſing the power of ordination and juriſdiction; but it cannot be proven that they had the ſole power of it, no more than that they had the ſole power of preaching, as they were appointed to do both, 2 Tim. iv. 2.; but the caſe is this, only Timothy is written to, as being there at that time, and being the chief perſon in the preſbytery, who preſided in it while

there; but what was obſerved in Acts xx. over-throws all the arguments for his prelacy, brought from the firſt Epiſtle, where they chiefly or only lie, for it was written when Paul was at Macedonia, before he came to Miletus, where he met with the preſbyters of Epheſus, and gave them his farewell charge, declaring them the ſole biſhops of the church. So all the directions to him were as to an extraordinary unfixed officer, ſent on a ſpecial occaſion, to return when he had done his buſineſs, 1 Tim. i. 3. If he had been fixt biſhop of it, this had been a reflection on him; he was not a fixt paſtor any where, but an evangeliſt, 2 Tim. iv. 5. and ſo was Titus as we ſtill find them on journies, abſent from their pretended dioceſes, to water the church where need required, and never find them return to Epheſus or Crete after they left them they were the apoſtles aſſiſtants, attending on them or ſent by them. And in the Epiſtles to them, the apoſtle confounds the names and offices of biſhops and preſbyters, making them the ſame, which he would not have done if they had been different and unequal. Timothy and Titus had temporary offices of extraordinary power.

The third objection is taken from the angels of the ſeven churches of Aſia, Rev. ii. 3. Angel or meſſenger is a name common to all miniſters, but the Epiſtles directed to them cannot prove them to be more than the oldeſt miniſter, or the preſident, for there is no ſuperiority aſcribed to them; John ſeverely reprehends Diotrephes for affecting it, 1 John ix. But, ſecondly, a ſi-

gular name is often uſed in a collective ſenſe in ſcripture, Deut. xvii. 11, 12. Mal. ii. 7. Pſal. xxxiv. 7. Hoſ. xi. 2. Prieſt, angel, &c. *i. e.* a whole company, and a claſs of people. Thus, in the prophetic writings and viſionary repreſentations, it is uſual to expreſs a number by a ſingular; ſo in Dan. viii. one ram denotes many kings, ſo in Rev. viii. 2. ſeven angels denote all the hoſt; ſo the woman, beaſt, whore, dragon, are all collectives, and one candleſtick alſo; but the number is often changed from the ſingular to a multitude, Rev. ii. 24. to you, not to thee, &c. *i. e.* the ſociety of paſtors; and there's a clear difference betwixt them and the people, ii. 10. and as for v. 1. ſee before in Acts xx.; to make Timothy biſhop here, is doing him great injury, ii. 4, 5. And would the goſpel be removed from a whole church for the ſin of one biſhop, while the reſt of the paſtors and the church were not acceſſary? It is not meant of one, but all collectively. So the antients underſtood it, as Ambroſe, Auguſtine, Gregory, &c. It is the doctrine of all ſound Proteſtants, that the ſcripture is the only judge to decide controverſies, eccleſiaſtical or moral, in doctrine or worſhip, &c. There is no viſible infallible external judge, to whom all parties are bound to ſubmit; the divine authority is only in the dominical books; ſays Auguſtine, We ſeek the marks of the true church, and decide our cauſes by them, and theſe make us wiſer than the antients, Pſal. cxix. 100.; what is not clearly contained in ſcripture, or by neceſſary conſequence, is no part of our faith or duty, but only what is clearly revealed or com-

manded. Church authority is Popery, and a cypher, without ſcripture-authority. When the ſcripture fails them, they run to the antients for refuge, pretending that it was the moſt antient in eccleſiaſtical practice, but from the beginning it was not ſo. See Ayton's Chriſtian church. The Chriſtian church anſwers not to the tabernacle and temple, and the prieſts, high prieſt, and levites, as its model; theſe were types, and anſwered by Chriſt the anti-type; but it anſwers to the ſynagogue, as being moral; the paſtors and rulers are called the church in Matt. xviii. 17.

Having ſhewn there is no foundation for prelacy in ſcripture, we ſhall ſhew there is as little from reaſon, and then conſider its origin, and how it was introduced. Dioceſan prelacy is contrary to right and ſound reaſon; that one ſhould be paſtor of 1100 congregations, as the Biſhop of Lincoln is, and the Biſhop of London of all beyond the ſeas; that one be pilot to ſo many ſhips, or phyſician to ſo many patients, under pain of eternal wrath; (Baxter refuſed a Biſhopric, and would rather be a galley-ſlave;) whereas, they ſhould take the charge only of as many as they can overſee themſelves, and not truſt them to another; if the Biſhops entruſt others to do their work, Chriſt may beſtow upon them their wages; they are commanded to do the work perſonally, Acts xx. 28. John xxi. 15, 18. 1 Pet. v. 2 Tim. iv. Reaſon ſays, that the who preach the word ſhould exerciſe diſcipline on the diſobedient and ſcandalous, and have power of governing the church, and that the

ſhould be an equality of labour, authority, and revenues, among paſtors. But in Engliſh prelacy, a lay-chancellor, and ſecular court, has the power of diſcipline; and they cannot call him to an account, nor can they prohibit from the ſacraments; one man has the power of ordination, ſuſpenſion, and depoſition; but in the midſt of counſellors there is ſafety. The Biſhop is a Pope in his dioceſs, independent and accountable to none; and though he do little or none of the paſtoral work, he has almoſt all the wages. It is indeed ſhameful that he ſhould have ſo much, and the labourers ſo little; that one ſhould have above a thouſand, and others not half a hundred, but the inequality is ten times as great in ſome places. Their arguments for unity and preventing ſchiſm have ſtill greater force for a Pope. Biſhops have cauſed the greateſt ſchiſms, as Victor, Donatus, Neſtorius, Macedonius, Polycrates, Paulus Samoſatenus, &c.; and there was unity in Sparta where there were two kings, and in Athens, Rome, Venice, Genoa, Switſerland, and Holland, being republics; and the parity among Biſhops and Archbiſhops is as ready to breed ſchiſm as among paſtors. The parochial Biſhop, or paſtor of the flock, is the ſcripture Biſhop, and the true Biſhop, Acts xx. And Timothy was ſuch, if among the reſt at Epheſus; ſo that Preſbyter and Biſhop are the ſame, and have the ſame power of ordination, juriſdiction, and government, as well as of diſpenſing the word and ſacrament; for if they have power only as to doctrine, worſhip, and the ſacraments, then they are but half paſtors. Dio-

ceſan prelacy is not only contrary to reaſon and ſcripture, or divine appointment, but to antiquity and eccleſiaſtic conſtitution; it was not eſtabliſhed by any eccleſiaſtic council for ſeveral centuries, and no general aſſembly ſince the reformation eſtabliſhed it, ſo that it is a ſchiſm; nor would a general aſſembly in any church eſtabliſh it, as it is againſt the rights of the majority. The ſcripture makes the title Biſhop belong equally to every paſtor; and it is very remarkable, that wherever the word Biſhop occurs in ſcripture, either the text or context guard it from falſe gloſſes, ſo that it ruins their cauſe, and therefore none durſt ever bring any argument for dioceſan biſhops from the places where the word Biſhop is found, but they fly them as a hot iron. See Jameſon on the Epiſcopal Controverſy. Providence has ſo ordered it as with regard to the cup againſt Papiſts. Their grand Herculean argument is, If it be not of divine original, how is it that the original of it cannot be ſhewn? and this is the ſame argument that the Papiſts uſe for many of their errors, which crept in gradually and unawares. The inventors of many uſeful arts are not known; we can better ſay when it was not, than when it preciſely began.

Parochial prelacy began in the ſecond century, dioceſan in the fourth, and liturgies began alſo about the ſame time, as an antidote againſt the Arian and Pelagian hereſies. The deficiency and ambiguity of records, for ſeveral ages after the apoſtles, leaves us at an uncertainty as to many things. The Acts of the Apoſtles is the

firſt eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, viz. that of planting or conſtituting the church; and the darkeſt and moſt defective period in eccleſiaſtical records, is from the end of it, till about the middle of Trajan's reign, *i. e.* till about 116. or 120.

Hierom, the chief of the Latin fathers, ſays, that the church was governed at firſt *communi preſbyterorum concilio*, by the common council of preſbyters; and the learned Dr Blondel, in his elaborate defence of Hierom, proves that there was not a biſhop over preſbyters before 140. Ignatius, John's diſciple, in his epiſtle to the Magneſians, written in 150, quoted by Turretine, calls preſbytery, or church-adminiſtration by it, Chriſt's law, becauſe it was ſettled by the apoſtles according to Chriſt's will; and calls it a novel inſtitution, taking place in his time, to advance a biſhop above a preſbyter. Chryſoſtom and Theophylact on Phil. i. tell us, that not only during the apoſtles lives, but the next ages, the names of biſhop and preſbyter were not diſtinguiſhed. Ireneus, biſhop of Lyons in France, in 180. uſes the names Biſhop and Preſbyter in the ſame ſenſe in all his writings; and lib. 4. c. 43. of hereſies, he expreſsly calls preſbyters the apoſtles ſucceſſors.

There were two or more biſhops in one city, as of Rome, &c. in the firſt ages, that is, nothing but a collegiate miniſtry. There were 100 in the Iſland of Crete, which had but 40 cities. And Patrick ordained about 300 in Ireland, that is, about as many as there were of pariſhes or congregations. See the evidences of theſe in the

rights of the chriſtian church *. And it was near 1000 years before it was formally eſtabliſhed in Scotland. The firſt was Palladius in 500, a miſſionary from Rome, on account of the Pelagian hereſy that aroſe in it. It was reformed from paganiſm and popery by preſbyters.

The ancient fathers of the three firſt centuries neither own nor plead for the divine right or inſtitution of prelacy, but only eccleſiaſtic cuſtom; they plead no ſcripture-arguments, but own the ſcripture-identity of biſhop and preſbyter; had they believed that, would Gregory Nazianzen ſo pathetically lamented the beginning of it, as to ſay, Would to God there had been no prelacy! and wiſhed it aboliſhed? Cyprian of Carthage, *de unitate eccleſiæ*, and other fathers that were for biſhops, adduce no ſhadow of argument from ſcripture. The argument which he and the other fathers uſe is Peter's preſidency, for they ſeem to own him to have been conſtant preſident in meetings, and yet own him to have had no more power than others, and thereby deſtroy their own argument. Cyprian pleads for no more, and owns preſbyters the apoſtles ſucceſſors as well as biſhops. None of them aſſert biſhops to be a diſtinct order. And ſynods of biſhops ſometimes choſed preſbyters to preſide over them. Origin, a preſbyter of Alexandria, was preſident in the ſynod held at Philadelphia, 237. Epiphanius, at the end of the fourth cen-

* There are ſeveral books of that name, according to the ſeveral rights of the church.

tury, is the firſt that pretended arguments from ſcripture againſt Jerom's attack of it, and he alſo pleads the divine right of metropolitans over biſhops, and of patriarchs over metropolitans. Ambroſe on Eph. iv. highly commended by Auguſtine, tells us, that the government of the church was not the ſame in his time as at the beginning, *primo preſbyteres Epiſcopi appellabantur*. Preſbyters were called Biſhops at firſt, but on the enlargement of the church, it began to be governed by another order; and tells us of rectors and preſidents, and that the eldeſt of them held that office during life, and then got the name of Biſhop appropriated to him. Many other fathers acknowledge that preſbyters and biſhops were the ſame, and that therefore the apoſtle did not mention preſbyters, Phil. i. But when one became conſtant preſident he was called Biſhop, and preſided at ordination, or ordained, and the preſbyters did all elſe. When a contention aroſe about the preſidency, not the oldeſt, but the greateſt, or the one that had moſt intereſt, was elected. This was in the parochial preſbytery, or council of preſbyters.

The way that candidates were prepared for the church, was firſt to make them deacons, or ruling elders, then preaching elders, ſubject to, and commiſſioned, or employed by the paſtor, as need required; and they continued his colleagues, or aſſiſtants, till they were called to charges of their own: but it was alſo the practice of the apoſtles and primitive fathers to ordain ſeveral paſtors in one church, for more authority, and the defence of Chriſtianity againſt the Hea-

thens: and as their bounds were large, and their flocks widely diſperſed among the Heathen, while ſome were ſuccouring the perſecuted, or viſiting the ſick, and endeavouring to convert the Heathens, others diſpenſed the ordinances to the congregation. The paſtors lived moderately then, and the Chriſtians were very liberal in their donations. The paſtor, and the college of preſbyters, that aſſiſted him in diſpenſing all the ordinances, and chiefly in ruling, being joint in the exerciſe of diſcipline, was called the Parochial Preſbytery, and was ſomewhat ſimilar to church ſeſſions among preſbyterians. Prelacy firſt took place in parochial courts; the conſtant moderator, or preſident, was called Biſhop, and poſſeſſed with this pre-eminence above his colleagues by their election, being reckoned head paſtor. When the number of Chriſtians increaſed ſo that they were divided into more congregations, the original mother one pretended the pre-eminence over the reſt, which were ſomewhat in the ſtile of chapels of eaſe. Thus parochial grew to dioceſan prelacy. And they next contended for pre-eminency of cities or ſees; and thus archbiſhops and metropolitans aroſe, and patriarchs over provinces, &c. It was 150 years before prelacy ſenſibly appeared, it was 300 before it came any conſiderable length, and 500 before it became properly dioceſan, or provincial, and 900 before it arrived at the height it is now at in Rome and England. The fathers did not foreſee to what a length ſmall beginnings may grow.

1ſt, Conſtant preſidents got ſome ſmall degrees of more power, though they knew that biſhop

and preſbyter were but different names of the ſame office, and that there were only two orders, viz. biſhops and deacons; yet they thought the church had power to divide theſe into different degrees, or claſſes, as they did that of deacon into archdeacon, ſubdeacon, and deacon; ſo they thought they might divide that of biſhop into preſbyter, biſhop, and archbiſhop, and thought theſe of ſuperior gifts ſhould be ſuperintendents: yet they did not reckon them different offices, but different degrees of the ſame office; and preſbyters not only diſpenſed the word and ſacraments, ſat and ruled in courts, excommunicated, or reſtored penitents, but ordained and confirmed. Euſeb. lib. vi. cap. 44. p. 245.

As there were no colleges of old, the candidates, beſides devoting themſelves to ſolitude, or the hermetic monkiſh life, for ſtudy and devotion, being retired from the world for a time; they were alſo trained by lower offices, and under the direction and inſtruction of the biſhop. When they were ordained preaching elders, they were put into full orders, and not empowered to do a part of the office only, as in modern times, and the greater part too before they be empowered to do the leſſer, an inconſiſtency: and they did the biſhop's office in his charge when he was ſick, or abſent at ſynods, &c. as he deſired them, before they got charges of their own.

The biſhop's flock was called Paroikia, or Pariſh, not Dioikia, or Dioceſe. See Euſeb. eccl. hiſt. We read of the pariſh of Alexandria, of Epheſus, Carthage, Athens, &c. The biſhop's whole pariſh, dioceſe, or flock, met in one place

with him on Sabbath. There was but one altar and one biſhop in every church or dioceſe. Tertulian de corona Militis ſays, The biſhop baptized all, and knew all the flock. Prelatiſts could never produce one congregation wanting a reſiding biſhop during the three firſt centuries. Baſil, Ambroſe, Auguſtine, Chryſoſtom, were only congregational-biſhops; and prelatiſts own, that it is not eſſential to biſhops to have ſubject preſbyters, or ſemi-paſtors, under them. Preſbyterian preſbyters have the ſame power, and are of the ſame order and office as their biſhops; but they ſay they want epiſcopal ordination. The ancient preſbyters were without flocks, or fixed charges, and aſſiſted the biſhop as he employed them: yet they were of the ſame order, and had intrinſic power of ordination and juriſdiction.

The conſtitution of the churches of Switſerland, Holland, Scotland, *&c.* are truly epiſcopal. According to the primitive pattern, their miniſters are biſhops duly conſecrate to that order, having the ſole power of ordination and juriſdiction, excluſive of lay preſbyters. The ancient preſbyters ordained alone when the biſhop was abſent, in Egypt and Alexandria, &c.; but that power was afterwards appropriated to the biſhop for maintaining his dignity: but the biſhop was only the principal preſbyter, different in degree, not in office. See Dr Field of the church. They object, that it was not deſigned to confer the full office on preſbyters at ordination; and theſe that are ordained by other preſbyters alſo want epiſcopal ordination, and none can give what they have not, therefore preſbyters have not the pow-

er of ordination and juriſdiction, and cannot ordain others, or biſhops. Anſwer, The office and power is from God and Chriſt, the fountain of it. If a prieſt at marriage ſhould not deſign the huſband to rule, that does not deprive him of the power which God by his ordinance has annexed; and in like manner preſbyters have their power from the charter of God's word; and this would nullify the power and office of all princes, magiſtrates, and popes, that receive their power, office, and inſtalment from the ſuffrage of the people, &c. The power of governing, and all power, is from God's appointment, and the people only deſign and ſet apart one for the office. Three neighbouring kings, archbiſhops, or popes, are not got to inſtal others. Chriſt never inſtituted a dioceſan prelate; it is a human office, and therefore has no power from Chriſt as ſuch, but only as preſbyter; but preſbyters have a ſcripture warrant, whereby every one hath the power of ordination and juriſdiction given him by the royal charter of the city of God, and a charge to execute it.

The Cyprianic biſhop was congregational, and had his parochial preſbytery for ruling; but in England a lay chancellor exerciſes diſcipline, a thing unknown of old. Beſides preaching preſbyters, there were others choſen from among the people for ruling as their repreſentatives, and theſe, in a ſtrict ſenſe, were not reckoned among the clergy. Deacons were factors for the people, to take care of the poor, 1 Cor. xii. 28. Rom. xii. 8. 1 Tim. v. 17. Acts vi. to rule, teach, and give alms. The Engliſh preſbyters

teach, but rule not, contrary to the ſcripture, and Cyprianic preſbyters.

The apoſtolic practice of ſettling a plurality of joint, or collegiate preſbyters, or paſtors, in a place for the reaſons before given, began to be aboliſhed in Cyprian's time. The biſhop, or preſident, aſſumed the whole office of paſtor, and degraded them to ruling elders; and the ruling elders began afterwards to be ordained to the miniſtry, to exerciſe their gifts as candidates: ſo the Cyprianic preſbyter is mixed of the ancient joint-paſtor preſbyter, and the ruling elder. Hence the cauſe of Hilary's complaint, that the ancient elders were nigh aboliſhed in his time, *i. e.* in 384; and that of deacon was alſo aboliſhed, as Chryſoſtom obſerves, Hom. xiv. on Acts vi. that ſuch deacons as the apoſtles ordained were not in the church. It is clear the ancients had two ſorts of elders, ruling and preaching ones, though all were ordained afterwards.

There was not a deſpotic prelate over many paſtors and flocks, or a biſhop of biſhops in the firſt ages. At the end of the 3d century an elder was an unfixed officer, not paſtor of a flock, having none; but an aſſiſtant to the paſtor in ruling, and preached only when aſked. In the 5th century he was one that had the care of a flock, as another's depute, a half paſtor, having no power of ordination and juriſdiction, and continues to be ſo in Rome and England. In the apoſtolic church, the preaching joint paſtors and ruling elders brethren made the parochial preſbytery. Theſe collegiate, or joint paſtors, were

called elders, or biſhops, indifferently: they had all an equal charge; they laboured and ruled equally, but when they choſe a conſtant preſident, partly from cuſtom, and partly for diſtinction's ſake, he got the name Biſhop appropriated to him; as now among preſbyters the name Miniſter, that is common to all church-officers, is appropriated to the paſtor, ſo of old the preſident ſuperintendent was called Biſhop. Thus the biſhop of Rome, Antioch, &c. meant no more than preſident of the church or preſbytery of that city; but that gave him no power over the reſt, they looked on themſelves as much paſtors of the flock as he. The appropriating this preeminence, or privilege of preſidency and biſhop to one, was one of the earlieſt deviations from the rule of ſcripture. What contributed to reſtrict the name Biſhop to the preſident, was the example of thoſe churches that had but one paſtor, or preaching preſbyter, where the name Biſhop was given him, to diſtinguiſh him from the ruling elders. The preſidents gradually aſſumed the direction, and afterwards, for maintaining unity and peace, the biſhops diſpenſed the ſacraments, as ſome called themſelves by the names of thoſe that baptized them, as in 1 Cor. i. 12.; and in imitation of theſe places, where any extraordinary unfixed officer, as an apoſtle or evangeliſt, reſided ſome time, as being preſidents during their abode there; and hence called Biſhops of theſe places where they reſided any time, or died, as James, biſhop of Jeruſalem, Peter of Antioch, Mark of Alexandria, though they were not paſtors or biſhops of particular

flocks, but had an unlimited charge and district to labour in; but the greater office includes the leſſer.

When theſe collegiate joint paſtors, that were ſettled by the apoſtles, or primitive fathers died, they ſettled one as ſole paſtor, who elected ruling elders, and licenced them for his aid, and their probation, till they got charges of their own. The principal thing that raiſed the power of theſe biſhops or preſidents was, that they were uſually the delegates of parochial preſbyteries, to repreſent them in councils; and when there were few preſbyters in theſe aſſemblies to oppoſe their ſchemes, they deviſed new methods to raiſe their dignity, power, and ſuperiority; one of the firſt was, that biſhops or preſidents ſhould have a new ſolemn ordination, peculiar to themſelves, diſtinct from preſbyters, by the neighbouring biſhops; and ſo they got the power of ordaining, electing, and inſtalling the biſhop out of the preſbyter's hands. Hilary on Eph. iv. tells us, that at firſt the ordination of a biſhop and a preſbyter was the ſame; this new ordination ſecured them from being depoſed by preſbyters: to the former honour they got added the power of ordaination and preſbyters were only to lay on hands, and afterwards they pretended that was needleſs; yet they got not the ſole power of ordination for more than 400 years, and not without oppoſition; though the biſhops carried matters as they pleaſed in great councils, where there were few preſbyters; yet in leſſer ſynods, where many were to contend for their antient rights and privileges, it was not ſo. In the fourth ſynod of Carthage,

near the end of the fourth century; they got ſeveral acts paſſed in their favour, as, that they ſhould impoſe hands together with the biſhop; and canon 2. and 20. they got theſe novel rules and late eccleſiaſtic laws condemned that deprived preſbyters of their power, as of conſecrating deacons, &c. Parochial prelacy prepared the way to dioceſan prelacy; city biſhops began to uſurp over country biſhops, and to ſubject them under Conſtantine.

The council of Sardica, in 347. can. 6. decrees, That there ſhall be no biſhop conſecrated henceforth, in country places and villages, that had not revenues to ſupport their dignity; but only preſbyters ſhall be ſettled there; *ne vileſcat nomen Epiſcopi & authoritas.* Reducing the leſſer into ſubjection to the greater, paved the way to ſubject all to Rome.

The council of Nice in 326. decreed, That in every province one biſhop be chief and ſupreme, and called Metropolitan, and nothing done without him. Conſtantine the Great, from pious zeal, beſtowed great revenues on the church; and then the biſhops imitated the great men of the world, and thought it good policy to model the government of the church to that of the empire; that as governors of provinces preſided over magiſtrates of cities, ſo ſhould patriarchs over biſhops of cities; and this was thought convenient, and approved by the biſhops. The chief thing that gave riſe to dioceſan epiſcopacy was the converſion of the Emperor, and therewith the government, and many Pagans; when Chriſtians and congregations were multiplied,

in the compaſs of ground where the old congregation ſtood, that they did not multiply dioceſes and biſhops as congregations multiplied, but held all dependent on the original one. Should churches be meaſured by acres of land, and not by the number of ſouls, what right had a biſhop to claim the ſame ſpot for his dioceſe, when there were 100 congregations on it, as when there was only one? They ſhould have acted like the bees. Theſe ſagacious creatures, when a ſwarm is caſt, they go and ſeek a new hive to themſelves, and form a ſtate quite diſtinct and independent of the other. What right had the former Chriſtians to ſuperiority over the new converts? But ambition did not ſtop here, the biſhops of ſuperior cities were not at reſt till they got the ſuperiority over inferior ones. Hence in this manner aroſe archbiſhops and patriarchs, which laſt were the chief of a province, being ſuperior to metropolitans. There were five famous patriarchs. The biſhop of Carthage was patriarch or primate of Africa, the biſhop of Alexandria was primate of Egypt, the biſhop of Antioch of the Syrians, the biſhop of Conſtantinople of the Greeks, and the biſhop of Rome of the Italians; and there was next a conteſt among theſe who to be primate or Pope, which was ſometimes claimed by the biſhop of Rome, and at other times by the biſhop of Conſtantinople, after it became the royal city. John, biſhop of Conſtantinople, thirſting for pre-eminency, graſped at the title of Univerſal Biſhop of the whole church, to be prelate or pope over it in 600. Gregory the Great, biſhop of Rome

oppoſed and condemned that title, and in Epiſt. 30. ſays, Whoever deſires that title is the forerunner of antichriſt; yet his ſucceſſor, Boniface III. obtained it in the manner already related. Thus the huge mountain of the Papacy roſe from ſmall beginnings. From the firſt preſbyter, or preſident, roſe the biſhop; from the firſt biſhop, the metropolitan; from the chief metropolitan, the patriarch; and from the chief patriarch, the pope; which gave reaſon to all to ſay, with godly Nazianzen, Would to God there had been no prelacy! This antichriſtian hierarchy was the image of the firſt beaſt, or Pagan hierarchy; for Rome Pagan, beſides inferior clergy or prieſts, had Flamins Arch-flamins, Proto-flamins; and at Rome the Pontifex Maximus, or high prieſt. And the emperors aſſumed both the temporal and pontifical ſupreme power, as the pope did over the Chriſtian ſtate. The apoſtolic canons 6. 61. 83. decreed to depoſe the biſhops that had civil employments or offices, and engaged in the affairs of the world.

That there ought to be an equality of power among the clergy, is the doctrine of all reformed churches but England; as the Waldenſes 1160, the Albigenſes 1190, the Wickliffites 1370, the Huſſites 1400, Switſerland, Savoy, Piedmont, Geneva, France, Germany, Bohemia, Hungary, Poland, Holland, Pruſſia, Saxony, Wittemberg; Luther agrees to it in the confeſſion of Augſburg, and the articles of Smalcald, ſubſcribed by him and Melancton, and all learned judicious divines, commentators, polemics, ſyſtematics, agree to it. And many, of both Rome

and England, are of the ſame mind. Gratian, the monk, who compiled the canons of 1140, aſſerts the identity of biſhop and preſbyter. Peter Lombard, maſter of the ſentences, ſays, the primitive church had but two orders, preſbyters and deacons. Eſtius Aquinas Bonaventure, and moſt of the ſchoolmen, are of the ſame mind; as alſo Durandus Aureolus, Cardinal Cajetan, &c. Eraſmus on 1 Tim. iv. 14. Caſſander, &c. were of the ſame mind, as Chryſoſtom, Auguſtine, Pope Urban. At the reformation the church of England was generally of this mind. See the book called the Inſtitutions of a Chriſtian, publiſhed 1543, by the authority of Henry VIII. and both houſes of parliament. The famous archbiſhop Cranmer, the chief of the Engliſh reformers, and the biſhops Jewel, Bilſon, Morton, Beddel and Hooper, Latimer, Bradford, Lambert, Fulk, Fox, Pinkington, Whitgift, Downham, Hooker, Willet, Whitaker, Holland, &c. agree, that there are only two orders, preſbyters and deacons, and that the ſuperiority of a biſhop over a preſbyter is not of divine right, but of eccleſiaſtic cuſtom.

The Lutheran biſhops, or ſuperintendants, are not a different order from preſbyters, but are ſettled by them, and have little above three or four hundred yearly. And the notion that there is no church without a dioceſan biſhop, *i. e.* a biſhop of biſhops, or ſubject preſbyters, &c. unchurches all the reformed churches, and renders their ordination and baptiſm void, if no ordination is valid but by theſe biſhops; thus ſome

bigotted prelatiſts have perſuaded ſome weak preſbyterians to be baptized again. But diſpenſing the word is a higher act than diſpenſing the ſacraments, and either of them is a higher act than ordination or juriſdiction, and the exerciſe of diſcipline. Yet ſome of both parties think the mode of church-government does not affect the doctrine or worſhip, faith or practice, of Chriſtianity, or private Chriſtians, and therefore it is a matter of leſs importance; yet it is not a matter of indifference to theſe church-officers, that are deprived of the half of their office, and of the power of doing their duty, in exerciſing diſcipline and juriſdiction on offenders, which alſo gives looſe reins to ſuch, and affects the practice of religion and civil ſociety, as well as deprives them of an equality in revenues, labour, and power.

That ſome church-power, government, and diſcipline is neceſſary and of divine right, for maintaining order, &c. is ſelf-evident; for where no diſcipline or power is exerciſed, vice has looſe reins. See Rutherford's Divine Right of Church-government.

Dr Barrow, a great prelatiſt, ſays, that princes, by the law of God and antient practice, may erect, enlarge, and diminiſh biſhopricks as they pleaſe; therefore the King and parliament of Britain did right in 1690, in multiplying theſe in Scotland into ſingle congregations, and making as many dioceſes as pariſhes; they did not aboliſh, but multiply biſhopricks. The conſtitution of the churches of Scotland, Geneva, Holland, &c. is truly Epiſcopal, according to the

ſcripture pattern, and the primitive ages of the church; their miniſters or paſtors are biſhops duly conſecrated to that order, having the ſole power of ordination, excluſive of ſingle preſbyters. At the reformation in Scotland there were ſuperintendents, that were to be ſuperior to others in labours, inſpection, and care, as well as in precedency.

And the eminently great and good biſhops, Uſher, and Hall, were for no more prelacy than perpetual moderators. That one ſuppoſe the metropolitan in the preſbytery, or the moderator or preſident in his turn, have the charge of inſpecting the reſt, if they perform all the parts of their office with fidelity and care, and behave ſuitably, and have authority to cite them immediately before the court, if they act otherwiſe; is a more immediate way of maintaining church-diſcipline and regularity than where none has the charge of ſuch inſpection more than another; and what is every body's buſineſs is reckoned nobody's.

We ſee the form of churches now is either Congregational, having the ſupreme power entire in themſelves, independent of external power: Or, ſecondly, Dioceſan, under one prelate or dioceſan biſhop. Though the Scots prelates had ſeveral preſbyteries under them, and they were not the moderators or preſidents, but ſome of themſelves; ſo that it is difficult to ſay what is the bounds of a dioceſan church, whether it is a county or not, or what are the number of congregations and ſubpaſtors in it: Or, thirdly, Provincial, under one patriarch, as the Greeks and

eaſtern churches are, though it is difficult to ſay what is the bounds of one of theſe: Or, fourthly, National, and it is difficult to ſay what is the bounds or extents of one of theſe: Or, fifthly, Catholic, as the church of Rome holds herſelf to be, and as the Donatiſts did in Africa, and as in fact ſeveral ſectaries do.

The firſt has one paſtor; the ſecond and third are ſubject to one prelate, or particular pope, the fourth is under the government of one ſupreme court, the fifth is ſubject to one univerſal prelate or pope.

We proceed now to conſider ſome hereſies and ſchiſms of leſs note, and therefore ſhall be brief.

Some old Pelagian and Popiſh hereſies were revived in the 16th century by James Arminius, profeſſor of divinity at Leyden in Holland, he died in 1609. He revived the doctrine of freewill, which Pelagius propagated in the fifth century, and which Auguſtine, the advocate for free grace, ſo vigorouſly oppoſed, who was reckoned the next great champion in defence of free grace after Paul, as Luther in oppoſition to the Romiſh doctrine of works, merits, &c. was reckoned the next after him. Pelagius, like Arius, often changed his ſentiments, and therefore is ſaid to have a lunar faith. The fact is, when mankind err from the way of truth, they know not well where to ſettle or fix, and can find no reſting place. The doctrine of free will implies either the perfection of human nature, that it is free of corruption, and in its primitive ſtate, or

elſe that baptiſm regenerates, as the church of Rome teaches; and that all men err only by ſeeing and following bad examples, which leads them wrong; which is in a great meaſure the caſe, though not wholly ſo. Arminius had many abettors, but yet there were more againſt him. The ſynod of Dort 1618, conſiſted not only of the divines of Holland, but of commiſ. miſſioners from other reformed churches, as Great Britain, Heſs, Switſerland Geneva, &c. who condemned the doctrine of the Arminians, which they had reduced to five articles in their petition, preſented to the ſtates of Holland, called a Remonſtrance; hence they are called Remonſtrants, as the reformed were called Proteſtants, from the proteſt which the ſtates of Germany gave againſt the Imperial and Popiſh edict of the diet at Worms.

The five articles in which the Armenians differ from the reformed churches, otherwiſe called Calviniſtic, are the following: They deny predeſtination, perſeverance, and imputed righteouſneſs, and aſſert free will and univerſal redemption. As for the firſt, it is evident, that the Predeſtinarians and Antipredeſtinarians neither underſtand one another nor the doctrine itſelf; and it is eaſy to reconcile them, provided they can be made to underſtand the doctrine. Thoſe that deny predeſtination, or fore-ordaining, acknowledge preſcience, or fore-knowledge in God; and the other party aſſert, that the one of theſe implies the other, and that predeſtination, providence, and prophecy, are terms of the like import. Predeſtination ſignifies previouſly

to determine, or fore-ordain; providence ſignifies to foreſee, ſo as to provide; prophecy ſignifies to foretell, which cannot be done with certainty without fore-ordaining. The miſtake ariſes from applying to God, as in the other controverſy, what belongs to man, and, on the contrary; for there is neither fore-knowledge nor back-knowledge in God; his exiſtence is a point, (not in the mathematical but metaphyſical ſenſe) time is a part of that point: in eternity there is neither time to come, nor paſt, but an eternal now does ever laſt: therefore whatever takes place in time was preſent to God at the beginning of it: what is future to us is preſent to him; and, as every judge does, he paſſes ſentence on what is before him.

Thus much I have ſaid merely to put an end to this controverſy, elſe I had paſſed it over, knowing it is impious to pry into the plan of the divine government and decrees, whether they are abſolute or not. It is the will of precept that concerns us, and not the ſecret will, or the will of purpoſe. A certain judicious author ſays, None will diſcourſe on predeſtination, or the prophetic part of the Revelation, unleſs he be either mad, or intends to put his audience mad. Cajetan ſaid, Calvin was wiſe, becauſe he wrote not on the Apocalypſe.

There were two kinds of Predeſtinarians, called Supralapſarians and Sublapſarians. The firſt believe that God created a certain part of men and angels to be happy, and another to be miſerable. The other, of whom Calvin was, believe, that he determined to paſs by ſome of fall-

en men, reprobated and doomed to miſery fo
their evil deeds, and to elect or chuſe others t
ſalvation. Some, by the abuſe of this doctrine
pretend, that they need not uſe the means o
holineſs, as, if they are to be ſaved, they will b
ſaved though they do nothing, &c. But non
act on this principle in common life, to thin
they need not take food, or avoid danger, fo
they will live their appointed time. But th
means are appointed as well as the end, and
is by improving the means that we attain to ce
tainty as to the end.

2*dly*, They deny perſeverence, and aſſert, tha
the ſaints may fall totally, yea, and finally, fro
a ſtate of grace. They may indeed fall from th
exerciſe of it for a time, but not totally or fina
ly from the habit, or favour of God. His lov
like his word and promiſe, is unchangeable, an
Chriſt's merits and interceſſion are all-ſufficien

3*dly*, The Arminians aſſert free will. This
have ſtated and diſcuſſed in the Deſign of Cre
tion, and ſhall be ſhort on it here.

1*ſt*, Man certainly is not a machine that is o
ly acted upon by external objects, and does n
act from internal principles.

2*dly*, He does not act from fatal neceſſit
but from choice, elſe he could not be capable
either virtue or vice, rewards or puniſhmen
by the juſtification or condemnation of his ow
conſcience, or of God. He has ſome power
will, as to avoid bad actions, and do good one
if not to avoid bad inclinations, or do good a
tions with proper motives and right diſpoſition
for to do which he needs ſupernatural aids, Jo

xv. 5.; but he can read, hear, think, go to church, and uſe the means of grace; and the very preſence of his fellow-men will make him abſtain from bad actions, as the ſenſe of immediate danger will make the brutes do.

4*thly*, The Arminians aſſert univerſal redemption. This is a vague and indeterminate idea, and it is not evident what they mean by it. Whether all men by the goſpel are brought into a ſalvable ſtate, or have ſufficient grace, that they reſiſt, and might be ſaved if they improved it; or whether Chriſt died for all intentionally, or virtually, ſo that his merit was ſufficient for all, which it certainly is. Irreſiſtable grace, as it implies compulſion, and not a voluntary compliance, ſounds harſh to ſome ears, but that grace is not ſufficient which is not effectual. Whether men are paſſive under the firſt actings, or operations of grace and of the Holy Spirit, or whether they concur, and are not wholly impotent, are rather too ſpeculative; let every one improve the means that would obtain the end, Numbers xxiii. 10.

Theſe four points are of leſs importance to be diſputed, as the believing or diſbelieving of them does not ſo immediately affect ſaving, juſtifying faith, and Chriſtian practice; even the diſbelieving perſeverance tends to make ſuch as have evidences of their adoption more watchful. But the

5*th* Point is the moſt important, viz. imputed righteouſneſs, though the diſpute about this is partly in words alſo, as moderate Arminians, who differ not widely from moderate Calviniſts,

underſtand much the ſame by grace. They aſſert, that juſtification conſiſts only in the pardon of ſin, which is obtained by the imputation of Chriſt's paſſive obedience, and not alſo in the imputation of his active obedience in fulfilling the law; and this leads them into groſs abſurdities, as to aſſert, that Chriſt, by his merits and interceſſion, procured acceptance for our ſincere tho' imperfect obedience, as if it were perfect, *i. e.* he procured an eaſier diſpenſation of the law ſuited to our imperfect ſtate; and this impeaches the divine wiſdom or goodneſs in not giving a law at firſt that would ſuit every ſtate: and they ſay, that if Chriſt's active obedience could be imputed to any, it could be imputed but to an individual, as he was but one perſon. But this is contrary to their own doctrine of the infinite merits of his paſſive obedience from his divine nature, which muſt be the ſame with regard to his active obedience. They hold, that he muſt have kept the law for himſelf, as he was man, but then his divine perſon exempted him from that in the manner of mere man. In oppoſition to their aſſertion, it is evident, that the law admits nothing but perfect obedience, James ii. 10. Gal. iii. 10.

Adam was created innocent, but was not entitled to eternal life by his innocence; he muſt keep the commands, and perform a courſe of obedience to fulfil the law. But though ſome great divines, as Tillotſon, &c. ſay they can find nothing more in ſcripture meant by juſtification than pardon or remiſſion of ſins, yet it is evident there is more to be found, Rom. v. 19.

where obſerve, that it was active diſobedience in Adam that was imputed to all his poſterity, and the contraſt is clear. Many other texts might be adduced. See this doctrine demonſtrated by Dr Owen on juſtification. The doctrine of original ſin, imputed and inherent, were conſidered on the article of popery; and it is evident, not only from the oracles of truth, Rom. v. 12. 1 Cor. xv. 22. but alſo from undeniable facts; the argument for man's mortality from the law of nature will not hold here; for though the brutes thus die, viz. by a condition of nature, as material ſubſtances are made up of parts, and therefore are liable to a diſſolution, or ſeparation of theſe parts, yet the analogy will not hold according to the moral deſign of the rational creation: animals and vegetables were to have but a temporary duration, a certain period being their term of exiſtence. But man was made for immortality; and as one part of him is immortal by a condition, or law of nature, viz. his immaterial part, his material part would have been ſo by favour, or by a law of nature and propriety, that his perſon might remain entire; for a diviſion in it was only the conſequence of his tranſgreſſion, forfeiting a title to favour, or the uniformity, propriety, and regularity of the courſe of nature; and from 1 Cor. xv. 22. it ſeems evident, that without the Mediator there would have been no reſurrection or reſtoration of the body.

That all Adam's poſterity are involved in the conſequences of his crime is evident from multitudes of fatal evidences; and particularly from

the pains and death of infants, that have not offended in their own perſons; and therefore it is by ſome previous crime, or moral evil, they ſuffer this natural evil. For diſeaſe, decay, or old age, and death, are penal evils, and proceed from a moral as well as a natural cauſe. Now this conſequence of Adam's crime to his poſterity can be only by his public capacity or connection, viz. his acting as a public perſon or repreſentative of them all, as an ambaſſador's conduct affects the ſtate he repreſents. Nor was it expedient, if poſſible, to treat with man otherwiſe than in this collective capacity; as his poſterity, who were inſeparably connected with him, were not in being, and were gradually to exiſt; and it was perfectly proper and reaſonable to include his poſterity in him in the treaty, for his own intereſt was as much at ſtake as theirs; and ſo not only a care for his offſpring, but for his own intereſt, ſhould have made him preſerve his felicity, and as he did not, none of his offſpring would have done it. That there was a federal tranſaction between God and our progenitor is evident from the threatened puniſhment, which implies a promiſed reward on fulfilling the condition; and it is evident, from other parts of the ſcripture, Hoſ. vi. 7.; in the Hebrew, it is Adam, which plainly implies that he tranſgreſſed a covenant with God; and he is called the figure of Chriſt, as he was a federal head, for they are repreſented as public perſons by the apoſtle, and the contraſt made confirms it, Rom. v. 1 Cor. xv. The poſitive precept was Adam's revealed religion, but he might have broken the

covenant alſo, by tranſgreſſing the law of nature. Had Adam kept the covenant during the ſtate of his trial and probation, *i. e.* till he was confirmed in the habits of virtue, whether it had been three years or longer, his children then would have been entitled to the conſequence, viz. happineſs as ſoon as they were in being. The condition was performing perfect obedience perſonally, both in parts and degrees, or doing every duty, and committing no ſin in thought, word, or deed, and the puniſhment was death in its utmoſt extent.

Some late eminent divines confound the covenants of redemption and grace: the firſt was made with Chriſt perſonally, wherein a reward for a certain work was promiſed, as is clear from the phrophet Iſaiah xlix. 6. (ſee Flavel on it,) and the covenant of grace was made with him as a public perſon, federal head, and repreſentative of believers. The condition to him was to fulfil both the precept and the penalty, Pſal. xl. 8. Matth. iii. 15. xx. 28. Rom. v. *i. e.* to perform the obedience it required, and ſuffer the puniſhment for breaking it, and all the ſins his people commit, as being conſequential of that corruption derived from Adam. Original ſin is twofold, viz. the guilt or puniſhment of Adam's firſt ſin, or that tranſgreſſion he committed in a public capacity in eating the forbiden fruit, which is properly called original ſin: though the term as applied to Adam's poſterity is diſliked; yet the thing is a melancholy truth, atteſted by facts and fatal experience. 2*dly*, The corruption of nature which man has from his

original conſtitution, viz. the violent propenſity of the ſenſual appetites to their objects in an irregular, or immoderate, and exceſſive degree; which become too ſtrong for the remonſtrances of reaſon, or the dictates of conſcience, and which pre-occupy the will, becloud the judgement, and inveigle the affections, and which pollute and pervert the whole ſoul, Gen. vi. 5. Pſal. li. 5. John iii. 6. And it is not only declared in ſcripture, but ſelf-evident from the light of nature and fatal experience. The heathen philoſophers lamented it; and, as Boſton ſays, it is like holding out a candle to let men ſee the ſun to point it out; though a great many of the prevalent vices and corruptions ariſe from imitation and example. The Mediator eſcaped this corruption of nature by his miraculous and extraordinary generation, and having no corruption, he was proof againſt temptations, for a ſpark will not kindle a flame if it fall not on combuſtible matter; and his holineſs of nature, righteouſneſs of life, and ſatisfaction for ſin, were the condition of the covenant of grace to him; and the condition of it to his people, is to believe he atoned for their ſins, and fulfilled all righteouſneſs, and to expreſs the fruits of that faith in repentance and obedience, living ſoberly, righteouſly, and godly, &c.; or, according to the apoſtle, faith and repentance are the conditions of the goſpel-covenant, Acts xvi. 31. xx. 21. The covenant of grace to believers was a covenant of works to Chriſt; it was juſt the fulfilling of the covenant of works, as the ſurety, and in the ſtead of ſinners; for, ſtrictly ſpeaking, there

can be no other but a covenant of works, duties, or obedience, between a Creator and his creatures, a Sovereign and the ſubjects of his moral government. It is called a covenant of grace to mankind, as all the benefits of it, though they were purchaſed by Chriſt, are free gifts to believers, as juſtification, adoption, and the kingdom of heaven; and even faith, the condition of it, is a gift or grace of the Spirit; but the promiſes are not all abſolute, as libertines aſſert; for the beatitudes, &c. are conditional promiſes, Matth. v. But anſwerable to the conditional promiſes there's a promiſe of the condition, or of the graces to diſpoſe to perform it, Ezek. xviii. 30, 31, 32. xxxvi. 25, 26. Acts v. 31. xi. 18. See Cole on God's ſovereignty. Witſius and Boſton on the covenants, Calamy and R. Erſkine on the promiſes.

We ſhall next conſider the controverſy with the antipedo-baptiſts, though it was prior to the arminian, yet it is of leſs importance. This doctrine was revived at the reformation, when religious liberty was recovered; as for ſeveral centuries the abſolute power of popery ſwallowed up all liberty, and ſuppreſſed all freedom of enquiry. They were called antipedo-baptiſts, from being againſt pedo-baptiſm, *i. e.* infant-baptiſm; and called Anabaptiſts, from their baptiſing again theſe that were baptiſed in their infancy, when they admit them members of their ſociety. The arguments for and againſt it, from reaſon and ſcripture, are indeed nearly equal. It is argued, that it is not their own act, and

therefore null and void, as they might have been initiated into the Jewiſh or Mahometan religions in the ſame manner, without their knowledge or conſent. And from the ſcripture, He that believeth, and is baptiſed, ſhall be ſaved; where believing is put firſt, Mark xvi. 16.; and the neceſſity of it is diſproved from the ſame text, as it is not ſaid, He that is not baptiſed ſhall periſh, but He that believeth not.

The arguments for it are the following, from reaſon: The children of citizens are born citizens, and entitled to all the privileges of citizens by birth before they know them; and from hence appears the abſurdity of calling baptiſm the admitting children of Chriſtian parents members of the viſible church. Children are to be conſidered of their parents religion till they chuſe another, and they belong to the church or ſtate they were bred in till they remove from it.

2dly, From analogy of reaſon and ſcripture: The Jews children received the ſeal of the covenant in infancy, and Chriſt came not to abridge, but to enlarge the privileges of the church of God. But then it is replied, that calling it a privilege is holding it regenerates, and is of abſolute neceſſity, which are popiſh abſurdities. And as it only entitles to the privileges of the viſible church, and does not bring into the inviſible, or regenerate, therefore it is abſurd to baptize ſuch as are dying, and will not live to enjoy theſe privileges it entitles them to; as it would be abſurd to give rights of heirſhip to a legacy, or eſtate to a dying child that will not enjoy them. And it is argued, that it was as much, or more a po-

litical than eccleſiaſtic rite among the Jews, and was performed by the parents as a domeſtic thing, and not by the church-officers.

Col. ii. 11. admits alſo of reaſoning from analogy, as it ſeems there to ſucceed circumciſion. The diſpute about the mode of it reſts on the ſignification of the word, which ſignifies the application of water any way, tho' the Anabaptiſts think dipping eſſential. Indeed it was the original mode for converts from Heatheniſm, and they were laid into the water as the dead are in their graves, and thereby ſaid to be dead to their former religion and converſation, and ariſen to a new one, by their ariſing out of the water. All this was externally the caſe with regard to their profeſſion, Rom. vi. 3, 4. But the mode of it is of ſtill leſs importance than the time of it: the ſubjects of it are the chief matter of importance. Some rejected water baptiſm, and ſaid, it was John's, and that of the Holy Ghoſt was Chriſt's. It is obſerved, that the form or manner of pronouncing the words in moſt places is perfectly abſurd, and ſupports the cauſe of the Anabaptiſts. Addreſſing a child by name, ſay they, is continued ſince the primitive times, and ſhews that it was originally conferred on adults only, and the form has never been altered, though infant baptiſm was introduced. Saying, I baptize thee, and not, I baptize this child, is as abſurd as addreſſing an animal, or inanimate creature, which they baptize in Rome. Mentioning the name has no connection with it, and has led ſome weak people to think, it is nothing elſe but giving a name. Conſecrating the wa-

ter ſeems to be without foundation from either reaſon or ſcripture. We pray that our food may nouriſh us, and for this reaſon we pray for the divine bleſſing on the elements in the Lord's ſupper, as well as for the ſpiritual bleſſing thereby ſignified to our ſouls. But none pray for a bleſſing on water, for the purpoſe of waſhing; its natural property is to waſh wherever it is applied or falls.

But what is ſufficient to determine the matter is, that we have an example of the one in the inſtitution, and none of the other. It ſeems to be a relic of Popery, firſt to conſecrate, or baptize the water, for they do ſo with almoſt all things eccleſiaſtic, as bells, founts, yea, and churchyards. As for the ſubjects of baptiſm, that great and moſt auguſt aſſembly of Weſtminſter declares, they are only the members of the viſible church, or the children of one or both parents being ſuch; for the converts from Jews and Heathens were Chriſtians by profeſſing faith in Chriſt, and practiſing it ſome time before they were baptized. But the children of parents under ſcandal, who have thereby caſt themſelves out of the viſible church, have no title to it; for if the child has not a title by the parent to any privilege, civil or eccleſiaſtic, it can have it by no other. Proxy-baptiſm is altogether contrary to the nature of things, the economy of the goſpel-covenant, or diſpenſation and reaſon, except the parents be both dead, who, had they been alive, were entitled to the ordinance for themſelves or their children; and in this caſe the neareſt heir, or rather the church, ſhould be

proxy; and only theſe that are worthy to partake of the Lord's ſupper are worthy to receive baptiſm for their children. As the child cannot act by reaſon of iis non-age, the parents act in its name; and as the ſacraments are ſeals of the ſame covenant, and inſtituted by the ſame author, they require the ſame qualifications.

If parents were out of the viſible church by their conduct, in breaking the rules of that ſociety, or under ſcandal at the time their children were born, theſe children, being born out of the viſible church, have no more title to baptiſm than theſe of Pagans, their parents being as ſuch at the time.

Chriſtianity, conſidered as a ſyſtem of religion, includes all natural religion and every duty, and therefore the goſpel-covenant includes the marriage-covenant; and thoſe that are born out of the marriage-covenant being born out of the goſpel-covenant, have no title to baptiſm, or the ſeals of the covenant, in infancy, or by their parents. The profanation and abuſe of baptiſm in theſe ways gave too much reaſon to the Anabapiſts to reject infant-baptiſm. There is indeed no evidence either for or againſt it, from example or precept, in the New Teſtament. Whole houſes being baptized is no more an evidence for it than that whole houſes believed, which implies only adults. And it appears, that it was held moſtly of indifference in the primitive church, for ſome Emperors and Biſhops were not baptized in infancy: and the difference about baptizing in infancy, or deferring it till the years of diſcretion, was not held a matter of ſuch im-

portance as to hinder them keeping communion with one another. See Wall's hiſtory of infant baptiſm, Bingham's antiquities of the Chriſtian church, and Sir Peter King's.

Our modern Anabaptiſts are very illiberal in holding ſprinkling and infant-baptiſm null and void, and baptizing them again; it were enough that they held them only improper; and they aſſume the title of Baptiſts, as if there were none that ever deſerved that title but them and John the Baptiſt. Some think it expedient to defer baptiſm to the years of diſcretion, becauſe of the groſs abuſe of infant-baptiſm. Libertine parents get their children baptized, and come under ſolemn vows and obligations, in ſo doing, to live like Chriſtians, and inſtruct and ſet a good example before their children, and never pay any regard to the performance of theſe obligations; and when put in mind of them ſay, they did that on account of their children, and not on their own account; and when the children attain to the years of diſcretion, and are told of their baptiſmal engagements by their teachers, which their parents had not told them, they ſay it was their parents that came under theſe obligations, and they have no concern with them. So the moſt pious and judicious think, it were better that children come to the years of diſcretion before they be baptized, and then if their conduct be ſuch as entitles them to it, and if they chuſe to come under vows and obligations for themſelves let them be baptized; but if their conduct is unaccountable who grow up to maturity, and profeſs Chriſtianity, and neglect the principal

ordinance, and the dying command of the Saviour, and more eſpecially theſe that receive baptiſm for their children; it is contrary to all order to baptize children to ſuch as neglect either family worſhip, Jer. x. 23. or the Lord's ſupper. The Jews, under the pain of exciſion, were to receive the paſſover at twelve years of age; and none among the primitive Chriſtians that had received baptiſm, neglected the Lord's ſupper; and none can be called Chriſtians in profeſſion, that have not received one of the ſolemn ordinances perſonally; as theſe are the diſtinguiſhing marks of the Chriſtian church; for every right-conſtituted, and well-regulated ſociety, has ſome rites to diſtinguiſh it from others; the feweſt it can have are two, one for admitting members, and one for the members keeping communion and fellowſhip with one another. When there was only one religion in the world, there was no need of a rite of admiſſion, and they had the Sabbath and ſacrifices for ordinances of communion. But when Abraham was called, the world was degenerated into the acknowledging, and worſhipping falſe gods; therefore circumſion was given him, as a rite of admitting members into the ſociety of the worſhippers of the true God; and as others kept Sabbath for communion, the paſſover was appointed as a rite of communion, as well as a mean and memorial of their protection from the deſtroying angel; and as Heathen idolaters increaſed their rites and ſacrifices, the church needed more for diſtinction; therefore all the males were appointed to meet three times yearly, at the tabernacle or temple, at the three

feaſts of the Paſſover, Pentecoſt, and Tabernacles, for more ſpecial communion, to prevent them from falling from the knowledge and worſhip of the true God. See the explication of theſe before on the Jewiſh religion; the Jews uſed baptiſm alſo for females, males, and proſelytes.

The Socinians, &c. rejected poſitive inſtitutions, as being too ſpeculative and philoſophical, theſe being not moral, natural, or rational enough for them. And the Quakers are too ſpiritual for theſe, and need not external ordinances or ſigns, as they have the thing ſignified; but this is rejecting the appointed means, and tranſgreſſing the authority of the Lord of the church. Socinians alſo deny the need of morality, to entitle them to theſe ordinances, or debarring the ſcandalous, and ſay, No qualifications are neceſſary, as it is only done in memory of a friend; but even granting it were not a feaſt upon, or in memory of a ſacrifice, or a ſolemn ſacrifical feaſt, that ſuppoſes peace with God, as a great author has ſhewn; and it is known what qualifications were required, for offering and feaſting on the ſacrifice; yet on their own principles it would be hypocriſy, &c. to one to attend a feaſt in memory of a friend, ſuppoſe an earthly prince, who was not well affected, but a rebel; and they are ſuch with regard to Sion's King that live in the practice of ſin, or neglect of duty. Phil. i. 21. Col. i. 21. 1 Cor. xi. 29. Some think, that children born in the church need not be baptized, but only proſelytes; that the com-

mand reſpected only ſuch. See Warden, and Boſton, on Baptiſm.

Moſt of the other ſects that remain to be conſidered are Enthuſiaſts. Enthuſiaſm, like ſophiſtry, according to the origin of the word, had originally a good meaning; this ſignified wiſdom, and that inſpiration; but by reaſon of falſe pretenders to theſe, another idea was affixed to them; hence ſophiſtry ſignifies falſe wit, or falſe reaſoning; and enthuſiaſm ſignifies falſe inſpiration, or a falſe perſuaſion of the divine preſence and influence, which perfects them in knowledge and holineſs, or a mere pretence to theſe. Two remarkable ſects aroſe in Germany of ſuch enthuſiaſts, or falſe pretenders to inſpiration, or extraordinary illumination, purity, and other divine endowments. Both thought they were as perfect as Adam in innocency, and therefore the one ſect rejected clothes, as the mark of crimes, and even met naked in their aſſemblies. The other juſtly obſerved, that laws and government ſuppoſe crimes as medicines do diſeaſes, and therefore attempted to aboliſh theſe, as marks of diſgrace to a perfect people, till they were checked by the government.

Another ſect of great enthuſiaſts aroſe in England about the middle of laſt century, who, from their manner of convulſive ſhaking, or trembling, when they harrangue, were called *Quakers*, or *Shakers*. Their founder was one George Fox, a ſhoemaker, who thought he was filled with the divinity. It is ſaid he had ſome ſcruples of conſcience which no divine could ſolve,

and at laſt he got them ſolved by the inward light, or internal ſpark of the divinity, and became a ſolution to himſelf; hence the principle of that ſect is to reſt wholly on the inward light for their inſtruction, and they reject all outward means, which they call uſeleſs forms. They call the written word a dead letter, and pretend that their light within is from the living operations of the Spirit, which ſupplies the uſe of books and inſtruction; and yet contrary to this principle, they harrangue in their aſſemblies, when moved, as they pretend, by the Spirit, which is an external mean of inſtruction, addreſſed to the ear; though they have often ſilent meetings, and reckon them the beſt. As they all pretend to inſpiration by the inward light, they all ſpeak as they are moved, both men and women, 1 Cor. xiv. 34. and have no particular order of perſons appointed for that purpoſe. They ſing none, as they uſe no books; and it ſeems the divine light does not dictate an unanimous ſong to them. They pray, and harrangue, and they reject the poſitive inſtitutions of Chriſtianity, as uſeleſs, ſaying, they have the inward baptiſm, and are nouriſhed by the body and blood of Chriſt, by which they mean internal divine light, of which the elements are only dead ſigns. They have their wives choſen by others, and ſent them, as the ſafeſt way; and they have peculiar modes of marriage and burial, which have little worth deſcription in them, they deny the reſurrection.

Their principle and ſcheme is precarious, as it depends on the meaning of the inward light

Either it is to be underſtood of reaſon, and then they are a peculiar kind of deiſts, though, contrary to others, they pretend not to have it by the exerciſe of their faculties, or to make any uſe of them, but to be wholly paſſive recipients or patients, or to have it by intuition; or elſe they are to be conſidered as high enthuſiaſts, actuated only by the impulſes of a diſordered ſpirit, or a religious melancholy or delirium. They acknowledge the ſcripture to be a revelation; but they pretend to be above it, having the immediate inſpiration of the ſame Spirit for their guide. Their notions of Chriſt are allegorical and peculiar; they ſpeak of the life, death, and reſurrection, of Chriſt, but do not thereby mean a perſon, but the light within. The life of Chriſt is the continuance of virtuous diſpoſitions in the heart, and the practice of them in the life; when theſe diſpoſitions, &c. are oppoſed or overcome by contrary ones, then Chriſt ſuffered and died, and when the good diſpoſitions recover their former life, then Chriſt ariſes. They have a great many peculiarities that are entirely innocent, and others excellent, they uſe a certain plainneſs of dreſs, &c. and ſpeak ſtrictly grammatically in addreſſing perſons, as they do not ſay you to a ſingle perſon; they uſe no games, diverſions, or merriment. They much reſemble the Eſſenes among the Jews in having a community of goods; and if they have not all things in common like them, the Spartans, the primitive Chriſtians, and the primitive inhabitants of the world, yet they ſuffer none of their members to want either the ne-

ceſſaries or comforts of life, and thus they excell others in brotherly love. They are peaceable, and harmleſs, quiet, and innoffenſive, and the only religious party that can boaſt of having never been of perſecuting principles; and tho' ſome hiſtorians ſay they were once furious and turbulent, yet I find no foundation for it; on the contrary, they do not uſe ſelf-defence in war, or otherwiſe, George Fox, their founder, having got one arm broken by ſome ruffians, held out the other, and they were ſo diſcreet as to break that too, taking Matth. v. 39. in an unreſtricted ſenſe. They hold every day a ſabbath alike, that is, not to uſe games, diverſions, &c.; but they aſſemble moſtly on the firſt day for convenience. They uſe not the Heathen idolatrous names of the days and months, but firſt, ſecond, &c. they give none titles, but call all men by their names; they will not give an oath of confirmation, allegiance, &c. but only their word, and they will not lie in the ſimpleſt matter, as in eating or drinking more for preſſing; they will pay no tithes, as they hold the clerical order needleſs, as it is on their principles, but ſuffer them to be taken without reſiſtance. This innate ray of divine light which they poſſeſs, independent of the uſe of any faculties of ſoul, unites them to the divinity, and brings them thus to the poſſeſſion of eternal ſalvation, provided the ſoul conquer all carnal affections, ſenſual appetites, &c. and give itſelf wholly up to the conduct of that inward light, and that it ſtifles all corruptions of nature, and brings them to perfection. For moſt enthuſiaſts pretend to

perfection. (See the reaſons againſt that doctrine on the Pagan controverſies, and the ſcriptures on the Popiſh controverſy.)

Their real principle ſeems to be a religious melancholy, or a melancholy mixed with devotion, which makes them take every notion or imagination that enters into their minds as a motion of the Spirit, or an inſpiration from God. They have a melancholy, downcaſt, ſedate aſpect; but many join their ſociety for temporal advantages; and many of their children want that caſt of mind, both which begin to deviate from many of their particulars, only they are all bound to marry in their own ſociety. They never go to law, or reſiſt evil, but patiently ſuffer in means, or otherwiſe, as obſerved before. Some of them acknowledge a perſonal Chriſt and his example, but they deny the Trinity, and are Socinians; and they hold a ſpiritual Chriſt too. They are very conſiderable for number and opulence, and are diſperſed through many countries, and yet hold general meetings, and know their numbers. One William Pen, being allowed to go as a refugee, went and planted a colony in Nova Scotia; being then a woody country, he called it Penſylvania, and the chief city Philadelphia, to denote their brotherly love. It is their chief ſeat, and is the pleaſanteſt city in the world.

Robert Barclay, a Scot, reduced their principles to a ſyſtem, called, An Apology for the Quakers, conſiſting of ſo many of their propoſitions as he could attempt to defend. They pretty much reſemble the myſticiſm of the early times. He attempts to prove their ſcheme the

only right one, from reaſon, ſcripture, and antiquity, and is the moſt ſubtile reaſoner, perhaps, ever wrote. The arguments are unanſwerable, but the hypotheſis, or foundation may be overturned, and then the ſuperſtructure falls with it. It is a dangerous deluſion to which they devote themſelves: they profane the Lord's day, and do not truſt in the Mediator, but in their own deluſion; and have not the right faith in Chriſt, nor are ſenſible of the miſery of the preſent ſtate, and the need of him. They do no miracles to prove their inſpiration, Iſaiah viii. 16, 20. The following is a piece of one of their ſermons:

"If all the ſeas, rivers, and lakes, in the world were in one lake; if all the mountains in the world were in one mountain; and if all the ſtones in the world were in one ſtone, and if that ſtone fell from the top of that mountain into that lake, it would be a dreadful plunge! A fine fancy! See John Brown's Quakeriſm the path-way to Paganiſm."

Another ſect of enthuſiaſts aroſe in Germany this century about 1720, or ſoon after it, called Moravians, from the province of that name. Their author was Count Zinzendorf. They alſo pretend to perfection, and intimate communion with heaven. They generally continue members of Proteſtant churches, but have the ordinances alſo diſpenſed to them by their paſtors in their own congregations. Their miſſionaries traverſe many countries, and make proſelytes. They hold themſelves the true followers of the Lamb, and worſhip only the Son. They almoſt adore mar-

riage, by reaſon of their myſticiſm concerning it, as they are alſo Myſtics. They deny that creation is to be aſcribed to the Father or ſanctification to the Spirit: they only miniſter to Chriſt. They depreciate ſcripture. They ſpeak of repoſing themſelves in the pierced ſide of Chriſt, as their bed, their hall, and their table. They are of Solifidian or Antinomian principles, and in a deluſion as to their own perfection. Theſe principles were confuted on Popery.

There are two ſects ſprung out of the boſom of the church of Scotland, the one a little after the beginning of this century, tho' the founder got not an aſſociate to form a body till near the middle of it; the other a little after the year 1730. It is difficult to ſay whether the contumaciouſneſs of the children, or the ſeverity of the mother, contributed moſt to the riſe of theſe, they were equally haughty and perverſe. Their froward and perverſe diſpoſition divided each of theſe ſects into other two parties. But as their leading principle is the ſame, we ſhall conſider them jointly.

They differ principally in one point, *i. e.* civil government, but agree in their terms of communion, which are very narrow. The firſt party are called M'Millanites from their founder, anti-government and anti-revolutioners from their oppoſition to both; but they are not Jacobites from the ſame principle that the non-jurant unqualified Prelatiſts are. They are frequently called Hill-men and Mountaineers, perhaps from their teſtimony's being dated at mount Herrick

1741, and Cameronians, from Cameron, to whom they have no kindred. They have assumed to themselves the title of Reformed Presbytery, thinking themselves the only reformed, or Christian church in Britain and Ireland, or perhaps in the world.

The other party have called themselves Seceders, that is, Separatists, or associates. Before I give their particular principles wherein they differ from one another, and from the church, I shall give the remarks of a traveller, which will shew their general principles, and wherein they agree with the church, &c.

A traveller, in his tour through Scotland, in order to form a judgment of the religious, as well as the natural and civil state of things, inquired into the number of religious communions, and went to hear and converse with each of them. Passing over his account of the Bereans, the Glassites, or Apostolics, &c. who reject all human writings, dispense the sacrament every Sabbath, and make all the gifted men pray in their turns, if not also expound and exhort, we shall only give his account of the parties that were most like the established church, and one another, and yet pretended to differ widely from her, and from one another, and each of them to be the true church. These were the two sects already mentioned. Having heard and conversed with each of them, he could find no difference in doctrine, worship, or church-government, which are the constituents of a church for they had all the same standards of doctrine, and they had the same way of worship, for they

had no muſical inſtruments, nor prayer-book, but ſing with the voice, and prayed extempore. He could find no difference in their religious ſervice but in the length and loudneſs of their harangues, and a lamentable tone of canting voice. As for their church-governments they were alſo the ſame, being all Preſbyterians. He could find no difference in religion, and yet they condemned one another, as if they had been Antipodes: and he concluded, that theſe parties that railed ſo on one another, and on the church, and ſaying they differed like light and darkneſs, were in a religious melancholy; not a calm one, like the Quakers, but in a raging one, as they had no real difference but with regard to the civil government and their terms of communion, and they ſpoke about the Spirit very like the Quakers. But he obſerved their conduct had the moſt deplorable effect on the people, as they could not underſtand the difference among theſe parties, their being none; they thought it was ſo great it could not be underſtood, and were diſtracted, and knew not what party to join. Thus the ſerious were diſtracted, and the profane made a ſcorn and reproach of them with their religious bigotry. He wondered theſe zealots had not pity on the weak, but thus ſtumbled them, and led congregations to wander, and neglect ordinances; and it was ſtrange to ſee how far they would run after thoſe who made the loudeſt outcry againſt all others, and therefore were beſt heard. And he obſerved, that nothing pleaſed an Engliſhman ſo much as to ſay, his country was going to ruin; and nothing pleaſed a Scots-

man ſo well as to tell him, his church was going to ruin.

What I am to ſay further on theſe parties I ſhall collect moſtly from the following eminent divines that have written on them, viz.

Shields on Church Communion; or, a Treatiſe againſt thoſe that ſeparate from the Revolution Church of Scotland; which he wrote out of compaſſion to theſe deluded people; in which he ſhews great abilities in learning, judgment, piety, and knowledge of the ſcriptures, and the nature of the Chriſtian church.

2*dly*, The great Boſton's ſermon on 1 Cor. i. 10. ſhewing the evil and danger of ſchiſm, written alſo againſt the anti-revolutioners, in which his uſual greatneſs of learning, piety, and judgment appear.

3*dly*, Lawſon's letter to Wilſon, on church communion, ſchiſm, and particularly that of the ſeceſſion, which is the beſt ſummary of the controverſy.

4*thly*, Curry's excellent eſſay on ſeparation and his plain perjury, and great iniquity of the ſeceding brethren's new covenant.

But the reader will pleaſe, in the firſt place review what was ſaid on ſchiſm at the beginning of the reformation.

We ſhall proceed then to conſider their differences, real or pretended, and to point out their miſtakes: they pretend to adhere to the national and ſolemn league and covenants; the one framed by the church of Scotland in the firſt period of the reformation, viz. from popery, and the other framed by the Weſt Aſſembly, in the ſecon-

period of the reformation, viz. from prelacy. It muſt be obſerved, that theſe covenants, though partaking of the perſecuting ſpirit of the times, were well deſigned, and neceſſary in theſe times; religious liberty, or liberty of conſcience, *i. e.* toleration, was then unknown in the world; when every party had power they perſecuted another, perſecution became neceſſary then as a ſelf-defence; in ſuch a deſperate dilemma, that we muſt either kill or be killed; and as popery and prelacy wanted to ſuppreſs and extirpate, or root out preſbytery, therefore in ſelf-defence it was neceſſary for it to ſuppreſs or attempt the extirpation of them. But the caſe was altered at the revolution, a period being put to perſecution, every one might be of the religion that was agreeable to his own conſcience; as religious liberty was granted, preſbytery was tolerated in England and Ireland, and eſtabliſhed in Scotland as formerly. England being reformed by prelates inclined to prelacy in church-government, and Scotland being reformed by preſbyters inclined to preſbytery, and wanted to have them eſtabliſhed, together with their different modes of worſhip, &c. and each of them got their deſire, and the great end of the national and ſolemn league and covenants was obtained when preſbytery was eſtabliſhed in Scotland. Whether theſe covenants are contained in the word of God, or they are not; if they are contained in it, then we are engaged to them and every thing elſe, at our baptiſmal covenant; if they are not contained in it, then they are ſuperſtition, or the uſing them is being wiſe above

what is written, as the addition of holy days is. (See Hutcheſon's diſſertation on covenanting,) wherein he ſhews there's no foundation for ſuch covenants in ordinary and peaceable times; the texts adduced to confirm that practice are rather applicable to God's covenants, and the ſeals of them, baptiſm and the Lord's ſupper; which is the beſt way of covenanting for either individual perſons or nations. However, the firſt ſect diſowns king and government, and profeſſes open rebellion, and calls the king a robber of Chriſt, and not a covenanted king, Jude, ver. 8. becauſe he will not execute theſe covenants in extirpating popery, prelacy, &c. and eſtabliſh preſbytery in the three kingdoms, as formerly in the ſecond period of the reformation. Now it is obſerved, that the Britiſh government is the beſt in the world, or that ever was in it, but that of Sparta in Greece.

2*dly*, That Britain has a covenanted king, for King William became king, not by conqueſt or ſucceſſion, but by agreement: but they and the Jacobite non-jurant church of England, a ſmall minority, uſurp the rights of the majority in not agreeing to the king and government.

3*dly*, Theſe covenants cannot be binding on theſe nations in time of religious liberty: when preſbytery is not attacked, or threatened with extirpation, it needs no ſuch defence, even on civil or political principles, by ſuch as have a title to maintain their rights as Britiſh ſubjects; for it is not as Chriſtians, but as Britiſh ſubjects that ſuch a ſelf-defence could be excuſed; for Chriſtianity is a paſſive religion, and thoſe who

are only overcome by ſuperior force, cannot be called martyrs, *i. e.* paſſive ſufferers, as witneſſes for truth. A Chriſtian is one character, and a Britiſh ſubject is another; and the latter has a right to maintain his liberties and privileges, if he has power to do it.

4thly, This anti-government ſcheme is contrary to ſcripture and the confeſſion of faith, to which they ſwear conformity, chap. xxiii. §. 4. "Infidelity, or difference in religion, does not make void the magiſtrate's juſt and legal authority, nor free the people from due obedience to him." See the ſcriptures there quoted, as Rom. xiii. &c. Now the confeſſion of faith was made after the ſolemn league, to ſhew what was the faith of the then covenanters, and this utterly deſtroys their cauſe; but the ſeceders have ſhewn their miſtake here, with much labour, both from ſcripture and the ſentiments of other reformed churches, for theſe parties have had a number of paper wars: though that party enjoy protection from foreign enemies, yet they will not contribute their ſhare with others, to ſupport fleets and armies, which is quite unjuſt and unreaſonable. Every preſbyterian wiſhes preſbytery were the eſtabliſhed religion of England and Ireland, and all Chriſtendom as well as they, and it is moſt the intereſt of the Engliſh and Iriſh diſſenters to do ſo; but then perſecution is not the Chriſtian way to get it done, nor the king and government to be diſowned for differing in religion, much leſs for not extirpating falſe religion. Formerly they would not go to law to recover juſt debts, as they held there

were no magiſtrates in the land; but now they have got a new light; it ſeems God has created a new thing in the land: but what a defection is this from their teſtimony and covenanted cauſe, renouncing it.

The ſeceders have endeavoured to adapt theſe covenants to the preſent circumſtances, and are ſeverely condemned by the other for butchering them; nor are any of the parties agreed how often to ſwear theſe covenants, if yearly, or once in life; nor have they any uniformity here. The ſwearing to extirpate popery, and never attempting to do it, or never intending it, is ſtrange, when they are ſuperior in numbers to them; they ſhould certainly beſtow their lives on ſo good a cauſe, on their own principles; but in fact, their ſwearing the covenants ſeems to anſwer no other purpoſe than vowing adherence to their parties, and never to deſert nor attend on ordinances with other Chriſtians, though they ſhould want them always, which they carefully obſerve. The M'Millanites are like the ten tribes, as Boſton obſerves, who would neither own Jeroboam for their king nor worſhip at Jeruſalem with them that owned him, and ſo made a ſchiſm from the church at Jeruſalem. The ſeceders new-modelled covenant, with the catalogue of faults of the church, and evils of the times, to be owned and lamented as ſins, refer to books of diſcipline *, and other old things out of print, and many of the evils, &

* The books of diſcipline contain contradictions.

they own are miſtakes, as will appear afterwards: they give an implicit faith, and ſwear blindly concerning things they know not, many of which are miſtakes. See Curry's plain perjury, and great iniquity of the feceding brethren's new covenant.

It is a pity both parties are ſo ſadly miſtaken, for they ſeem to mean well in their zeal about theſe covenants. They both pitch on the ſecond period of the reformation as their model, and condemn the revolution-ſettlements as different from that period; but they have miſtaken their plan here, as much as the Papiſts have done in chuſing Peter inſtead of Paul; for the firſt period, with John Knox the reformer at the head of it, would have ſuited their plan much better; but the ſecond period makes the greateſt appearance, as preſbytery was then introduced into all the three nations, and the Confeſſion Directory for worſhip, and form of church-government, &c. framed by that auguſt council at Weſtminſter. Of that aſſembly ſome were for independency, and the moſt part for a moderate prelacy, as ſuperintendents; but Sir Archibald Johnſton made a happy motion, which united their different ſentiments, to form that plan of church-government, which was moſt agreeable to the word of God, and the example of the beſt reformed churches; but it is the church of Scotland they hold a model, during that period. Beſides many examples to the contrary that might be given, one may ſerve; in the acts of the Scotch aſſembly in that period, is one, about the beginning of the ſeſſion in 1638, prohibit-

ing any to find fault with any acts that aſſembly ſhould make, under ſevere penalties. Was not this tyranny, prohibiting liberty of private judgment, and pretending to infallibility? That period had many good men, but the bulk were weak and intemperate in their zeal. It is remarked, that the faults they have to the revolution church, were no objections to them to ſtay in her communion till they were thruſt out, and then they became objections ſufficient to hinder them keeping communion with her. Mr M'Millan was depoſed, for diſorderly, diviſive, and irregular courſes, repeated after ſolemn vows for maintaining unity and regularity; and as he ſubſcribed his own depoſition, he had no right to exerciſe the office more than a layman. He kept poſſeſſion of ſome of the temporalities of the church, viz. the manſe and glebe, a number of years after his depoſition, being protected by the turbulent populace, and to which he had no legal right; he alſo occupied the church, and the one eſtabliſhed in his ſtead remained and officiated in a different part of the pariſh. He remained alone above forty years, till one caſt out of the ſeceſſion joined him, and thus formed a body or claſs, to licenſe others, without which his ſchiſm would have died with himſelf. That one, viz. Mr Nairn, indeed left the church of his own accord, for the faults he had to it, and joined the ſeceſſion; but finding they alſo had deſerted the teſtimony, and would not be reformed by him, he joined Mr M'Millan, and afterwards was ſo lax in his morals, as to fall into adultery, and was ſilenced for ever; being

caſt out of all parties, which ſhewed his zeal was not practical. Mr Ebenezer Erſkine differed with the church about the act of aſſembly 1732, which was for the heritors and elders, being electors of paſtors, to plant churches; he was for the people at large, in which both he and the aſſembly were wrong, as I have demonſtrated from ſcripture and reaſon, in a publication on that ſubject; it is the church-officers alone that have the ability and authority to do it, and the Seceders have fallen from their original plan into that practice, and have thus made a great and eſſential defection, which overturns their firſt foundation, and gives diſcontent and oppoſition; an inſtance of which took place on the Forth, where the people publiſhed a piece againſt their conduct, entitled the Cry of Oppreſſion, and ſeveral hundreds left the party; and they refuſed to ſettle others, where they were called by the people. Indeed they only among Preſbyterians ſeem to know how to plant and govern churches with good policy, for they keep their people in abſolute ſubjection, and ſecure them from being loſt, or in danger of it; as they are cut off from all other Chriſtians, as the primitive Chriſtians were from Pagan idolaters. The ringleaders of theſe ſects committed ſuch irregularities, as to baptize and marry, without the due order and form of the church, and to depoſe and elect elders in other pariſhes. See the records of their reſpective preſbyteries, and Currie's Vindication of the Real Reformation principles. Dr Potter publiſhed Evidences of money being ſent from Rome, to ſupport ſchiſm in

the church of Scotland; and Dr J—n tells of a miſſionary from it, violently preaching the covenants in the fields, in the ſtyle of a covenanter; and Mr S—t tells of another in the ſtyle of a Seceder, in order to divide Proteſtants; and both were diſcovered, and went off. The rule of Rome is, Divide, and you will deſtroy. Another appeared in the ſtyle of a Quaker; but his inſpiration ſerved him not to read every language, though the Jeſuits are very learned. It was obſerved, that the church, with her over-rigid authority exerciſed on irregularities, that were not immoralities, was the cauſe of theſe diviſions and rents in her; and theſe men looked on their being caſt out as oppreſſion, and it makes wiſe men mad. It had been better to have overlooked theſe irregularities, than breed ſuch diſorder in Chriſtian ſociety. Some men are ſo turbulent, that it is better to neglect them, than contend with them, and kindle their rage and revenge; for it is ſelf-evident, that their zeal to increaſe their party ariſes from theſe principles: pride and revenge raiſes the moſt furious oppoſition, and this does not hurt the intereſt of church miniſters, whom they level at, but hurts both the temporal and ſpiritual intereſt of mankind; the motive of the heads of theſe parties is ſaid to be, If the church will not be ruled by me, I will rent her to pieces. Were their zealous labours employed in converting Heathens, Mahometans, Jews, and Papiſts, it would be a good work; but to make a diviſion without a difference in religion, can do no good, but great hurt. Notwithſtanding theſe fatal effects of too rigid

authority, which bred ſuch ſchiſms, the church went ſtill farther, her moſt unaccountable tyrrany was, in ordering Mr Gilleſpie, the chief of the Relief, to preſide at a ſettlement, contrary to his conſcience, and depoſing him for not doing it. That was ſuch an act of tyranny, as is perhaps not equalled in modern times.

Whether his conſcience was miſtaken or not it was the ſame to them. Settlements by guards are very diſgraceful, as alſo a daily form in an empty church; both which might eaſily be remedied, or the matter accommodated, by both the preſbytery and the incumbent, had they any policy. But why did not the firſt one that voted to appoint him to do it, rather do it himſelf? As he pretended not diſobedience but principle, the ordering one to diſpenſe ſolemn ordinances to unworthy objects is of a piece with the other; nor will the pretence of being bound to obey the church, by ordination-vows, ſerve the purpoſe, as no vows can bind one to act contrary to principle or conſcience, or the law of God, Acts v. 29. This was a proverb among the Jews; and unlawful vows are better broken than kept, or, according to the common proverb, An unlawful vow may be lawfully broken.

If ſuperiors require obedience contrary to the command of God and his vicegerent conſcience, they ought to be diſobeyed; for the Popiſh pretence that the church is accountable, and not they that obey her, if ſhe be wrong, was confuted before. God alone is Lord over the conſcience, but ſhe has learned more wiſdom and moderation ſince, than to breed ſchiſms by ſuch

rigid and unjuſt orders; and, as Shields obſerves, it is not one act of tyranny or miſconduct that unking's a king, or unchurch's a church, or unminiſter's a miniſter, but the continued practice of it. The father of the Relief acted like a Chriſtian, in not running to the rigid extreme of totally giving up communion with the church, and thus unchurching it; though none ever had greater reaſon, but kept communion with all worthy paſtors, or miniſters of Chriſt, that entered into the office, and acted in it rightly: this Ebenezer Erſkine propoſed at firſt to do, but ſoon changed; and Mr M'Millan deſired his people rather to go to church than want the ordinances when he was abſent, but his ſucceſſors differ from him.

The Relief plan is the moſt liberal and Chriſtian in the nation, to keep communion with all ſaints, or with all with whom Chriſt keeps communion; and herein the church is too narrow; but yet that plan is impracticable, or at leaſt attended with great inconveniencies; as, on their principles, they ſhould leave a place when a worthy miniſter comes to it; but they never do ſo, and therefore act inconſiſtently. The church, in debarring miniſters that have been once in the Relief acceſs for ever to her communion, is like the Jews with the Samaritans, or the Novatians with the Delinquents; and in the worſt ſenſe is denying acceptance to a returning prodigal, unleſs ſhe thinks they have ſinned wilfully, for which there is no remiſſion. There are ſome of the Relief rules over both particular members of their body and over congregations too nar-

row and rigid, or tyrannical, on their own principles, and inconſiſtent with them, in caſting off ſome congregations and miniſters for acting according to their own principles. But my plan prevents me from attending to all the minute peculiarities of any of theſe three ſects that have ſprung out of the boſom of the church of Scotland, and adhere ſo cloſely to the plan of it; and yet condemn it ſo much, and pretend to differ ſo widely from it, which makes ſtrangers wonder at them with great admiration. However, tho' I do not intend to detain the reader long with trifles, I muſt attend to a few more of the pretended or real differences of the two former parties, as they are ſo numerous, the laſt party having few more than what have been notified.

It was obſerved before, that there is no perſon or church perfect, or without faults. This was the error of the Donatiſts and Papiſts. The firſt ſeparated from all Chriſtians in the world, to avoid promiſcuous communion; thinking they were defiled with the faults of their fellow-worſhippers, and that there was no true or pure church but their own, that they only were ſpotleſs. This ſchiſm laſted 200 years: and the Papiſts hold not only that their church is pure, but that it is infallible, and cannot err, and that there are no other churches or Chriſtians in the world, all elſe being the ſynagogue of Satan.

" A certain whimſical old wife could not find a pure church among all the parties in Scotland, tho' theſe two ſects both think themſelves ſuch. She drove her huſband from thence to England, and

not finding a pure church among all the parties in it, drove him next to America juſt when the wars began."

The principal faults or objections they have to the revolution-period of the church are moſtly groſs miſtakes, or miſrepreſentations of truth, and miſconſtructions of facts. Jaundiced eyes ſee every thing of their own complexion, and a melancholy mind ſees all things painted in diſmal colours, and they have the rare art of turning properties into faults. It is to be obſerved, that Shields's Hind let looſe is the great bulwark of defence that the Anti-revolutioners uſe. Now, ſince Shields is their oracle and ſtandard, let the matter be determined by him. But every man is allowed to explain his own meaning, and be his own intepreter. His Hind let looſe was written for a quite different ſtate of affairs, both civil and eccleſiaſtical; and cannot be applied to the revolution ſettlements, without wreſting it contrary to the author's own practice as well as principles; for he not only became a member of the revolution-church, but wrote his ſmall treatiſe on church-communion in defence of it, and againſt them, in which he ſhews his meaning both in the Hind let looſe, and ſome other books publiſhed in the former period. To prevent this miſapplication of the Hind, the other ſhould always be bound up with it; but they will not make uſe of the other, tho' it was written after the former, and explains it; in which he vindicates the revolution-church anent the civil magiſtrate, which we will ſoon conſider, and with regard to the members of it, ſome of which had

fallen to prelacy under the former eſtabliſhment. He ſhews, that they did not admit all of them, and that it would have been as uncharitable to admit none, and like the Novatians that denied repentance and remiſſion for ſins after baptiſm, and particularly to them that had made defection in times of perſecution and danger, as Peter did, and denied ſuch all acceſs for ever.

There was a book called Plain Reaſons againſt the Revolution-Church, compiled by a candidate for that party. It was collected from the reports of the ſociety, whatever any of them could ſay againſt the church, and conſiſted of groſs miſtakes and horrid calumnies; and Boſton, when dying, ſaid, he would not have been the author of it for all the world. But the compiler of it afterwards joined the Seceſſion, and they made him renounce ſuch of his plain reaſons as did not accord with their ſcheme.

Boſton, Williſon, &c. obſerve, that the revolution church conſiſted of many worthy confeſſors and ſufferers that had weathered the ſtorm of perſecution in the former period, and made uſe of the toleration, rather than the church ſhould not have the benefit of their labours, and they not be uſeful, and they never ſaw cauſe to repent of it. The revolution church ſat ſo down, and was ſuch a conſtitute court of Chriſt, and diſperſed their labours ſo well through the nation, there being far more kirks than miniſters, that they juſtly raiſe the admiration of ſtrangers when they read the acts of Aſſembly at that period; who cannot avoid ſaying they were a great and wiſe

body, and conducted their affairs with judgment and moderation at that period.

But then the great objection they have to the revolution church, and not only the firſt aſſembly that conſtituted it, but all ſucceeding ones, is, that they ſit down in the king's name, and the civil magiſtrate is the head of the church; and therefore ſhe is an eraſtian church, having the king for her head: this is the great bugbear that is held out to fright the populace. However, the more weight this argument gets, it makes the more againſt them; but as we intend to give a juſt repreſentation of both the properties and faults of all parties, and contend only for truth, we ſhall give it its full weight; but we muſt firſt define the bounds of an eſtabliſhed church, and ſhew wherein it differs from diſſenters. It is the opinion of ſome, that the civil magiſtrate ſhould neither eſtabliſh nor oppoſe any mode of religion; it is only mens practices, and not their principles, that are the object of civil laws; for if the king eſtabliſh any religion it will be his own, and he is as liable to make a wrong choice as others; and the independent diſſenters in England are of this principle, they think an eſtabliſhed church is a worldly kingdom; as the very idea of the word eſtabliſhment denotes, being ſupported by the worldly powers: but others are of a different opinion, and think the civil magiſtrate ſhould be the guardian of the church, to countenance, ſupport, and protect her; and of this opinion are the Scots diſſenters, for in fact they are not diſſenters in the true ſenſe, but only murmuring

for want of eſtabliſhment, and that the king will not be ſubject to their dictates with regard to religion. Eſtabliſhing a church means beſtowing a part of the public or civil revenues on it for ſupport; 2*dly*, Countenancing and protecting it, in the adminiſtration of the doctrine, worſhip, diſcipline, and government; and this ſuppoſes the magiſtrate to be preſent at theſe. But this is a different thing from being head of the church; the head directs and conducts all the members of the body in their operations, and communicates the vital ſpirits and influences, or capacity of action. A political head, as of a domeſtic or civil ſociety, makes laws, and requires obedience, that all things be done by his order, and manages all affairs; but in this right view of headſhip the king is not head of that church of which he is a member, no more than he is head of the kingdom of France; for he did not compoſe her articles of faith, though he approved, and ratified, and eſtabliſhed them, for the ſupport of the true faith; he did not compile her liturgy, or prayer-book, forms of adminiſtring the ſacraments, &c.: he is indeed head of the revenues, or ſalary he gives, to beſtow it on thoſe that apply for it; but then they are ſuch as the church commiſſion to officiate in it; the king has not ſo much as a vote, unleſs he be an elder or member of the church, and then he votes or ſpeaks as a member, and not as a magiſtrate. The moderator, or preſident, conſtitutes the Scots aſſembly, and concludes it by prayer; and after it is conſtitute, the king congratulates it, and aſſures it of his countenance

and protection, and ſays not a word more unleſs they go beyond their province, to intermeddle with ſtate-affairs, and concert a rebellion; and when the aſſembly is concluded and diſſolved by the preſident, he diſmiſſes it, and he and they mutually agree where to meet again; and though the church, of which the king is a member, be prelatic in its government, yet he did not plan or chooſe that ſcheme; for King William was bred a preſbyterian, and only agreed to ratify the mode the church deſired to have eſtabliſhed.

But I am neither defending nor condemning eſtabliſhed churches, or the king's connection with them; but even ſuppoſe him to be head of the church, and that her courts ſit down in his name, then he is alſo the head of their communion, and their courts hold by him, and ſit down in his name in a ſpecial manner. For it is by their own voluntary choice, and they have it in their power to caſt him out if they pleaſe; for the Confeſſion, which they make their ſtandard, was ratified, confirmed, and eſtabliſhed by the king's authority, and not only authoriſed by him, but by both houſes of parliament, and it is their rule in all their proceedings: but they may be aſſured, that liturgies and confeſſions are the idols of the populace; and if they would reject it, that would give their popularity the fatal blow, and ruin their cauſe. And that Confeſſion itſelf gives him more power than he exerciſes, as to call ſynods, and have every thing rightly conducted at them, and all the ordinances rightly adminiſtred and ſettled duly, &c. Confeſ. ch. xxxiii. §. 3.

Rom. ii. 1. And, as Boſton obſerves, the Confeſſion ſhews the meaning of the covenants, and was adapted to them; and the covenanters, *i. e.* the makers of it, owned the king's authority, even when he oppoſed the covenant, as well as before he ſwore it: ſo they meant not to own no king but one that had taken the covenant; ſo that ch. xxxii. §. 4. is not meant of an uncovenanted land; and, as Boſton adds, let them bluſh to ſay they agree with the reformation periods and the martyrs; they make them die like fools, not knowing for what they laid down their lives, they can claim no kindred to them.

Their objections to faſts being appointed by the civil magiſtrate are refuted by expreſs ſcripture; where we find examples and authority for faſts appointed by kings, 2 Chron. xx. 3. Jonah iii. 5. obſerved by their ſubjects, by families, Zech. xii. 12. viii. 19. and by individual perſons, Dan. ix. 3. Acts, chap. xiii. xiv. If a maſter of a family has a right to call out the family to defend and preſerve the houſe when attacked by robbers, or on fire, a king has the ſame right to call the ſubjects to the beſt means of defence, which is faſting and prayer; and it is breaking the fifth command to diſobey the king's authority.

Another objection to the church is, that her paſtors come in by the patron, and not by the door, *i. e.* the choice of the people. I took notice of the true way of planting churches before; and have only to obſerve, that the blame of any miſconduct on that head is unjuſtly laid on the patron; he only gives a title to the beneficence

beſtowed on that church when he founded it, and cannot give it to any but ſuch as the church-officers pleaſe, *i. e.* ſuch as they declare qualified for both the office and the place; when they licence, or put in orders, they declare their licentiates qualified to labour in any part of the vineyard where they can get a maintainance, or a bond of ſecurity for it. And indeed if they were perfectly attentive, they would put none into orders but men of ability and morality, or of parts, learning, and piety, that none could oppoſe; but indeed they have often no ſenſe of ſhame, in oppoſing the greateſt and beſt of men, whom their church-officers or ſpiritual guides appoint them, but will prefer the one that is longeſt and loudeſt. One of the few, ſenſible, and judicious, having heard ſuch an one in a certain ſectary, who had that falſe popularity, ſaid he was only a mole-catcher, as he gained only the applauſe of the weak and ignorant, or the whimſical.

Creeds, liturgies, confeſſions, prelacy, patronage, were all well deſigned at firſt; the three former, to maintain ſoundneſs or unity in doctrine; the fourth, to maintain unity in communion; and the laſt, to ſupport religion. My plan forbids me to detain to go through all the objections which theſe parties have to the church. I ſhall now be very brief; I have obſerved, that they are moſtly groſs miſtakes, as that of the reformed preſbytery aſſerting twice in their teſtimony, that the church of England is idolatrous, which is ſo manifeſt a miſtake, that every one may ſee it. It is obſerved, that an ill-tem-

pered zeal runs through many of their writings and diſcourſes, that their zeal is hot, but their charity cold, John xiii. 35. Each of the parties are divided, and they condemn one another with as much bitterneſs as they do any elſe, though it is difficult to know what they differ about; the firſt party differ in their opinion about univerſal redemption, but I have not been able to learn that they have any adequate ideas about their difference; they did not go to the extremity of the other, having profited from their fatal example. The Seceders divided firſt into Burghers and Antiburghers; and the latter delivered the former to Satan, and the ſon the father. The moſt horrid conduct among Chriſtians of the ſame doctrine and communion! unparalleled tyranny! This was a moſt terrible rebuke in providence to the author of that party, being from the party he formed, and his own ſon; however, he was more moderate after that; and the difference was about nobody knows well what; for a Burgeſs oath requires only to maintain the liberties of the city, and the privileges of the ſtate, and government; and all that own government, as they both do, admit that. There are only a few towns that can be excepted, where the Burgeſs oath has abſurdly a religious clauſe concerning the eſtabliſhed religion; but then they had only to keep out of theſe few towns, and many of the Antiburghers are Burgeſſes in cities. Thus the Antiburghers degenerated from the teſtimony, and the principal authors of the party, and alſo inflicted cenſure on the other, as if they had done it, and one not

adequate to any ordinary crime, but only to fundamental error, or groſs immorality; which ſhews they were only moved to it by an evil genius. The curſe cauſeleſs falls on the head of him that uttered it. But the greater part of them now ſee the abſurdity of it. The report that the other party delivered them again to the devil, as they had done them to Satan, ſo that they are as much allied as before, is groundleſs; their ſentiments ſeem to be, that they muſt ſeparate from all that they differ from in opinion about any thing; but on this principle there can be no ſociety, except on the Popiſh plan, in which plan all muſt think as the Pope does, and make him their infallible rule, to yield implicit or blind belief and obedience to him, and make no uſe of their own judgement, or exerciſe their reaſon to think for themſelves, as they have no right or liberty to do ſo. For two are the feweſt that can make a ſociety, and there are not two that think alike on all points, or ſcarely on any; mens opinions and ſentiments vary ſtrangely, like their faces; however, on this principle they forſake the communion of all ſaints, contrary to the Confeſſion, chap. xxvi. §. 2. "Saints by profeſſion are bound to maintain an holy fellowſhip and communion in the worſhip of God; which communion, as God offers opportunity, is to be extended to all that call on the name of the Lord Jeſus." But they will rather neglect the public worſhip, and ordinances God hath appointed, as means of ſalvation, than do this, contrary to Heb. x. 24. Nor is it an excuſe, that they may do their beſt at home, or in private

meetings, as that is to neglect God's appointment, and chuſe their own way, which cannot have his preſence or bleſſing. But this conduct rather ſeems to intimate, that each of them think they are the only church, and that there are no ſaints out of their communion, as the Donatiſts did of old, and the Papiſts ſtill do; and ſome of them expreſs thus much, though others have more charity, and allow that there are both miniſters and Chriſtians that are ſaints, in other communions; and that they have even a right to receive the ſolemn ordinances in their own way, but not with them; and this is ſaying, Stand by, I am holier than thou; which ſhews leſs humility, and more ſpiritual pride; and they condemn the Relief for keeping promiſcuous communion, becauſe they keep communion with all whom they are obliged in charity to think Chriſt keeps communion with; but then this condemnation falls ultimately on Chriſt for keeping ſuch promiſcuous communion, for they only follow his example here. But, ſays Boſton, I will follow Chriſt to the ſynagogue, and be ſtricter than they who ſcruple to follow his example; for the nearer I am to him, the ſtricter I am, as he is the rule.

This conduct is, in fact, excommunicating all others, and making all churches ſynagogues of Satan, or making new laws for God's houſe, and terms of communion ſtricter than his, viz. their covenants and teſtimonies, &c. and thus aſſuming the royal prerogative of the head of the church, and thus ſtraitening the door of God's houſe, and ſhutting out his children from the

proviſion of it. Nothing ſhould be a term of communion but what is eſſential to ſalvation; the doors of the church ſhould be as wide as thoſe of heaven. For any to wander from their own communion when they have ordinances diſpenſed in it, is an impious curioſity, unleſs it be once or twice for trial, 1 Theſſ. v. 21. and ſhews they have neither reaſon nor religion; for if they think another party better than their own, why do they not join it? if they do not think it better, why do they leave their own to go to it? He that wavereth is like a wave of the ſea, driven with the wind, and toſſed; and let not that man think he ſhall receive any thing of the Lord, ſays the apoſtle.

The apoſtle Paul, as Boſton obſerves, interpoſes the authority of Chriſt, 1 Cor. i. 10. who enjoined peace and brotherly love to all his followers whom he will own as his. The church of Corinth was then bleeding of the wounds, not given her by avowed enemies, but by profeſſed friends. He that ſheddeth man's blood by man ſhall his blood be ſhed; but he that ſheddeth the blood of his mother church, a parricide, and of the church of God, by God ſhall his blood be ſhed. Schiſm, ſedition, hereſy, and profaneneſs, go together, as in Corah and the ten tribes. Error, and immorality, and ſuperſtition are diſeaſes in the body, but ſchiſm is the deſtruction of it. Though there were fundamental errors, groſs immorality, and ſymbolizing with idolaters at Corinth, yet ſchiſm is the firſt thing blamed by the apoſtle. They who have moſt of the Spirit of Chriſt are moſt for peace and unity, Eph. iv. 3.

The pretence to ſtrictneſs gives riſe to ſchiſm. Thus the Phariſees were ſtricter than Chriſt, and the falſe apoſtles at Galatia than Paul. Separation is ſinful, if communion can be kept without ſin. See Rutherford's Peaceable Plea.

Ringleaders of ſchiſm, like the Galatian teachers, always level at the ambaſſadors of Chriſt, to mar their labours, and ſcatter their flocks; and they that any way countenance ſuch, bid them God's ſpeed, and thereby are partakers of their evil deeds, ſays Boſton. Every matter is not a ſufficient reaſon to breed diviſion in a family, to ſeparate the neareſt relations, or to cauſe rebellion in a ſtate, much leſs diviſion in a church. The ſpirit of Satan is a ſpirit of diſcord and diviſion. The rule is, Separate from the faults of Chriſtians and corruptions of any church, but not from the ordinances of Chriſt and the communion of ſaints; for Chriſt will forſake ſuch as forſake his ambaſſadors and his ſaints. Separate from them where they are wrong, but not where they are right. But it is a contradiction to join in family-worſhip and not in public worſhip, when they are the ſame people, but only a ſmaller number, and the ſame way of worſhip. It is one thing to diſſent from an eſtabliſhed church, and another thing to ſeparate from the communion of all ſaints. Diſſenters may be of great uſe, as a means to prevent an eſtabliſhed church from falling into total defection and corruption. The Engliſh Preſbyterians and Independents deſired to have their differences and contentions buried in oblivion at the revolution, and to be termed United Brethren; and it is to be hoped

the Scots ones will ſoon do ſo too, as they dif. fer much leſs; and ſome of theſe two parties are turning more moderate, and tending to it; and though they have great blunders, yet they want not properties, as both miniſters and people are more laborious and diligent in the exerciſe of religion than many others.

It is a complaint, that Diſſenters are more hypocritical, or prone to cover their vices with a maſk of religion than others; but this is not to be attributed to that way, unleſs their principles and doctrines tend to the Solifidian, libertine, and Antinomian ſides; for thoſe who want to put on a maſk of religion to cheat and deceive, will doubtleſs join the party that is ſuppoſed to be the ſtricteſt or beſt. See Webſter's letter to M'Millan, Durham on the ſcandal of Schiſm, Rutherford's Peaceable Plea, &c.

The laſt ſect we ſhall conſider is one ſprung out of the boſom of the church of England called Methodiſts; but it is rather a religious ſociety than a ſect. The founder of it was Mr Whitefield, a great and good man, who propagated Chriſtianity at home and abroad. The riſe of this party was pretty much like that of the forementioned in Scotland. There is another party of them, the followers of Mr Weſley, whoſe principles are more doubtful. His followers are numerous, and are members of eſtabliſhed churches, and attend them regularly, and meet for their religious ſervices at other times of the day. But they differ from other religious ſocieties in this, that they have ſome who preach to them, but do

not diſpenſe the ſacraments, as they receive theſe in the churches. They have ſome peculiarities, as love-feaſts, and relate their experiences to one another; and, like the Moravians, pretend perfection, and have other whimſical notions, and heretical opinions. See a more particular account of them in an appendix to a ſermon on the improvement to be made of religious diviſions, by the ingenious and pious Mr Martin.

They are very devout and peaceable, and zealous for reviving vital religion, as the zeal of many of the Engliſh diſſenters is not equal to that of their anceſtors, ſince hereſies, and more conformity to the modes of the church are got in among them; and their intereſt, together with that of religion, is on the decline. There are ſome other hereſies and ſects which are entirely whimſical, or enthuſiaſtic, and are well known in their reſpective places, whom it is better to paſs over than mention, to be known elſewhere. They are ſimilar to ſome which appeared in former times, that ſpeedily ſprung up, and ſuddenly diſappeared, whoſe names we ſhall alſo paſs over in ſilence.

We proceed now in the laſt place, to conſider the Antinomian hereſy, which is the worſt of all, as it is a complication of all others; it implies, not only wrong practices, but wrong principles, which lead to theſe practices; it was the firſt error both in opinion and practice; it implies what is wrong in thought, word, and deed, the diſorders of the mind, inclinations and diſpoſitions; deſires, appetites, and paſſions; pur-

poſes and reſolutions, which are virtual actions, as hatred is accounted murder; when luſt hath conceived, it bringeth forth ſin, and when ſin is finiſhed it bringeth forth death.

The law is the rule or right way, the plain and ſtraight path; the way of virtue and holineſs is the honourable ſafe way; he that walks uprightly, walks ſurely. The way of vice is a dark, dangerous, crooked path; iniquity is that which is unequal; ſin is erring from the mark, and loſing the prize. Tranſgreſſion is breaking the barriers, or going over boundaries.

It is argued, in favours and defence of purſuing the objects of the appetites and deſires, that it is following nature to gratify its inclinations, which were deſigned to be gratified, and enjoy their objects. This is argued chiefly in favours of the ſenſual appetites, but it is equally applicable to all. The two laws of animal nature that man poſſeſſes, in common with the brutes, are ſelf preſervation, and the propagation of the ſpecies; but the practice of theſe is to be regulated by reaſon and the moral ſenſe, which the brutes have not. Therefore meat and drink are to be uſed in moderation; for if any uſe them to exceſs, like the brutes, it tends to deſtroy inſtead of ſupporting nature; for health conſiſts in temperance alone, and life is to be hazarded in the defence of religion, liberty, and one's country. And the propagation of the ſpecies, to continue the human race, muſt be ſubſervient to the rules of good order and ſociety, and not the lawleſs irregularities, and licen-

tiouſneſs of the animals, to gratify only the animal appetites.

A conjugal ſociety muſt be formed, by the union of huſband and wife, for their mutual comfort, and uniting their care of their offspring. But even the animals, in their natural ſtate, that are not reduced into ſubjection to man, pair as ſoon as they are capable of propagation, and live as it were in chaſte wedlock, without forſaking their own mates, to adulterize with others *; and a certain wood-land dove never aſſociates with another, or enters into a ſecond wedlock after its mate dies, but ſtill deplores its deceaſed mate. But if indulgence be pled for one appetite, as following nature in gratifying its requeſts, then it may be pled for every one, as gluttony, drunkenneſs, whoredom, covetouſneſs, theft, robbery, fraud, deceit, extortion, oppreſſion, &c. and ſome are ſo ſavage, as to delight in cruelty; and then there is no ſafety for either perſon or property.

The laws of virtue do not prohibit any enjoyment, but only the irregular or exceſſive purſuit of it, which is hurtful to the individual, as well as ſociety. The matter of no action is a crime, but the form, circumſtances, motives, &c. conſtitutes the crime. Murder is only the taking away of life, but the difference lies in taking it

* A certain king would make no laws againſt adultery, as he thought ſuch a thing could not be; it being needleſs for a man that has a wife of his own, or a woman that has a huſband.

away innocently, or by accident, or in ſelf-defence, or lawfully for a crime; which logicians diſtinguiſh into murder, chance-medley, and man-ſlaughter. Whoredom is only propagating the ſpecies, but then it is out of the regular order of marriage. Lying is only uttering words, but then they are not juſt or true. Covetouſneſs is only deſiring certain objects, but then they are another's. No vice differs more from another, than the ſame vice does from itſelf in different circumſtances, called aggravations, as againſt knowledge, &c, or by one that ſhould be an example to others of the contrary, as ſuperiors, parents, maſters, teachers, magiſtrates, the aged, &c.; what is wrong in mere ſpeculation only perverts, but does not pollute the mind. What refers to practice, and eſpecially the ſenſual vices, pollute and defile the mind as well as pervert the conduct. Vice is a vile, loathſome, odious, abominable thing, compared to the vileſt things, and moſt loathſome diſeaſes, as the plague and leproſy that excluded from ſociety; and it is as infectious as ill air, or poiſonous food, and to be dreaded accordingly. Moral diſeaſes are moſt infectious. Virtue and vice are oppoſite, as light and darkneſs, health and ſickneſs, order and confuſion, yea, life and death. Iniquity changes the nature of things, and turns them upſide down, as order to confuſion, light to darkneſs, health to ſickneſs, the beautiful frame of nature to chaos. It deceives by fair appearances of pleaſure, profit, honour, and advantage, and yields the contrary, as pain, ſorrow, loſs, diſgrace, in the end. Moral evil is

the ſource of all natural evil, as poverty, pain, diſeaſes, toil, labour, ſorrow, wars, ſlavery, death, &c. Virtue, or religion, has the oppoſite effects; it is the ſoul of happineſs; it changes ſorrow into joy, and gives light amidſt the darkſome night, and vale of death; it deſcends from the ſource of perfection and happineſs, and moves towards it, till it be joined to it. The philoſophers repreſented ſenſuality, ignorance, and vice, by death; and ſet up cenotaphs, or empty coffins, in the places of them that had deſerted their academies; and gave up with learning and virtue. Religion converſes with God and the heavenly ſociety. The impreſſions of piety and virture on the mind, are a ſurer evidence of aſſurance of the divine favour than a revelation from heaven.

Religion is the life, the light, the health, and happineſs of the ſoul in every ſtate; it is the cement of ſociety, the ſupport of laws and government, the nurſe of liberty, as Plato ſays. Judea, Greece, and Rome, flouriſhed while they preſerved integrity and fidelity. Abraham feared he would loſe both his wife and his life at Gerar, becauſe the fear of God was not there. The emperors of Rome coveted religious titles more than civil ones, as pious, holy, &c. Thoſe that robbed even Heathen temples were viſibly puniſhed, as it was an inſult to religion, and ſacred things in general.

Atheiſm and anarchy go together; therefore all wiſe ſtates reverenced and ſupported religion, and the miniſters of it. The prieſthood was ſo highly eſteemed, that kings and emperors choo-

ſed to be prieſts: but theſe happy effects are eminently the fruits of true religion. How noble and ſublime are the rules of the Chriſtian religion, and the life of Chriſt, compared with that of Mahomet, a robber, plunderer, ſenſualiſt, cruel, and ſavage!

All vices are divided into ſenſual, which aſſimulate to the brutes, and diabolical; as envy, malice, hatred, revenge, pride, cruelty, &c. which aſſimulate to devils, and which are contrary to the laws of purity, piety, ſobriety, benevolence, humanity, meekneſs, patience, reſignation. Some vices yield neither profit nor pleaſure even for the preſent; as that monſtrous one of blaſpheming the name of God, taking it in vain by profane ſwearing, imprecating curſes or damnation, at which the devils tremble, James ii. 7, 9. Exod. xx. 7. The Heathens durſt not pronounce the name of their great god Demiurgos, leſt the earth ſhould tremble, and nature be removed from her ſeat.

We ſhall view Antinomianiſm in its largeſt extent, or whatever is wrong in the conduct of individuals, or contrary to the good order and welfare of ſociety, the laws of juſtice, integrity, liberty, charity, peace, truth, moderation, *&c.*

It is not the knowledge, but the practice of virtue that conſtitutes merit, or makes good men. The Gnoſtics of old valued themſelves upon their having a ſublimity and ſuperiority of knowledge, and thought they could be ſaved thereby without reducing it to practice. Speculative knowledge begets pride, which is the moſt unbecoming, unreaſonable vice in dependent beings,

whoſe life, and health, and proſperity, depend on a Power above. It was the firſt and greateſt error. Ignorance indeed is the ſource of it, and of unbelief or infidelity, and every error. But none can be ſaid properly to know more than what they practiſe; and faith without works, or the fruits of righteouſneſs, is alſo uſeleſs; and if theſe be real, they produce all their genuine effects. To act againſt knowledge or light is like ſwallowing poiſon, knowing it will be fatal: and Solifidians or Libertines are no better, for if they believe vice to be dangerous, why do they practiſe it? If they believe virtue the way to internal peace and eternal happineſs, why do they not purſue it? If they believe eternal miſery is the conſequence of vice, why do they not fly it? Men may live fools, but fools they cannot die. Libertines give looſe reins to all their evil inclinations. Faith without works is a mere fancy, and no faith at all. It is diabolical doctrine, that the greater the ſinner the greater the ſaint; that the more they ſin the more grace is magnified in pardoning their ſin. It would make the goſpel the miniſtration, and Chriſt the miniſter of ſin, and overwhelm the world with wickedneſs.

Temptation to ſin is properly the fear or feeling of ſome evil or ſuffering, and the deſire to avoid it, or get free of it, as perſecution, &c. This made Peter diſſemble in time of danger; for the allurements of pleaſures, riches, honours, &c. are not properly or ſtrictly ſuch, and they who cannot reſiſt theſe could far leſs ſuffer evil,

rather than ſin, or loſe all, Philip. iii. 8. for the cauſe of conſcience.

Agricola, in the 16th century, was the firſt that ſaid the ſame things were not ſins in believers that are ſins in others. There is no atonement for the ſin unto death, 1 John iii. 9. Holineſs is the health of the ſoul, and the ſoul of happineſs. Moſt of enthuſiaſtic ſects lean to the Solifidian or Antinomian ſide in their doctrines and principles, which is moſt agreeable to human nature. But works without faith or legaliſm is better than the contrary, as it tends to the good of ſociety. The doctrine of abſolute promiſes, abſolutions, and indulgences, are Antinomian; but we ſhall deſcend to a few of the particular irregularities and diſorders contrary to the public good, or the welfare of ſociety.

1ſt, Perſecution is contrary to the law of Chriſtian and religious liberty. There are four kinds of ſlavery; natural, which is that of individual perſons; moral, which is the ſubjection of reaſon to ſenſe, and the lower appetites of the ſoul; civil, which is that of a people or body-politic to a tyrannical governor; and religious, which is the being compelled by force to forſake the true religion, and the practice of morality, and adopt a falſe one, as idolatry, &c. Perſecution is the moſt unreaſonable, abſurd thing in nature; for no tortures can make one believe ſelf-evident abſurdities, contrary to reaſon and the common ſenſe of mankind, as tranſubſtantiation, that creatures and artificial workmanſhip are gods, or that a part of any thing is equal to the whole of it, and that two and three are more or leſs than

five. They may make men to diſſemble and hypocriſe, but they can no more change their mind than their body: It is acting like the tyrant Procruſtes, and is Antichriſtian in the higheſt degree, and the utmoſt degree of human wickedneſs.

Every one has a right to chuſe his religion, as well as the food that ſuits him. Reaſon, argument, and inſtruction, are the way to convince them that are wrong, and to propagate true religion, and not fire and ſword. Moreover, theſe cannot reach the mind, which is the ſubject of religion, though they may diſtort the body. Articles of faith and modes of worſhip, if not idolatrous, are not ſubject to civil laws, or come under the cognizance of the magiſtrate; it is not principles but practices that come under his juriſdiction; unleſs they be Atheiſtical or Antinomian principles, that lead to bad actions, and are virtually ſuch. It is the moſt unreaſonable thing in nature, to make one ſuffer in perſon or property that does hurt to no body. If people's religion is wrong it hurts only themſelves; and perſecutors not only put martyrs to death, but uſually tortured them in the moſt barbarous manner; and the profeſſors of all religions have perſecuted, but the Quakers; but there is no divine authority for it, and no divine religion was ordained to be propagated by it, 2 Cor. x. 4.

The Jews, in the days of David and Solomon, when they held ſome neighbouring people in ſubjection to them, did not compel them to become Jews, but only levied a tax on them, as conquered ſubjects. And Chriſtianity was pro-

pagated, not like Mahometaniſm, with fire and ſword, or by force, but by argument, &c.; and though the apoſtles, and numerous multitudes of converts, as 3000 and 5000, &c. could have muſtered up a body, and by miracles, like Joſhua, carried all before them; they could thus have conquered, and compelled all the world by force and perſecution, as Mahomet did, to ſubmit to them, if ſuch had been the genius of religion. But inſtead of that, they did not even uſe ſelf-defence, but paſſive obedience, and non-reſiſtance, ſuffering patiently. This irrational Anti-chriſtian madneſs the world is now rid of, as there is no public perſecution at preſent. Papiſts and Mahometans tolerate other religions. If the religion of any leads them to rebellion, or any diſorder in ſociety, then it is not perſecution, but civil puniſhment that is inflicted. Chriſtianity could not be ſuppreſſed by perſecution, but increaſed by it; ſo that it needs not the ſupport of worldly powers to involve it with politics, as a ſtate religion, John xviii. 36.; but yet in this reſpect it will be the ſupport of a ſtate, if practiſed.

2*dly*, Next to perſecution, ſlavery is the moſt unreaſonable, cruel, wicked thing, and contrary to the law of liberty. It is moſt unjuſt for rational beings to deprive their fellow-men of their natural right, and compell them by force and and violence to what is unreaſonable and unjuſt, or contrary to natural liberty; and exerciſe oppreſſion, cruelty, and ſavage barbarity; which is contrary to reaſon and religion, and ſuch horrid wickedneſs, that none poſſeſſed of humanity, or that is entitled to the denomination of

man could do, much leſs any good man. It is worſe than murder, for it is a lingring living death! Liberty is dearer than life, and ſlavery worſe than death. It is hideous to drag out ſuch a miſerable life, under the abſolute tyrannical power of another; and particularly to hinder them of the means of ſalvation, or the life to come; and keep them in ignorance, that they may not obtain liberty, according to the rule of Chriſtians and Mahometans, that make ſlaves of none of their own religion. The Britiſh civil laws and government are truly reaſonable and Chriſtian in this reſpect, as they admit not of ſlavery. How glorious is it to be a land of liberty, and to ſet men free from bondage and ſlavery! To buy and ſell our fellow-men, or rational creatures like beaſts, and hold them under barbarous oppreſſion and ignorance, is deſtroying both ſoul and body, and ſuch will be puniſhed accordingly, Rev. xxii. 12.

3*dly*, Wars are contrary to the goſpel of peace, i. *e.* the laws of the God of peace, and the Prince of peace; the Meſſiah, who was peace itſelf, and came to make peace. Whoever wantonly proclaims war, or engages in it unneceſſarily, thereby renounces Chriſtianity.

Self-defence is the firſt law of nature, and when our perſons or properties are attacked, it is lawful to defend them; contrary the principle of Quakers, who reject ſelf-defence as they do the means of knowledge; though the prophets that had inſpiration uſed them, as they had ſchools, and Daniel read and learned by books, chap. ix. ver. 2. Pſal. cxix. 97. But

whoever gives occaſion to the war, commits a
many murders as there are perſons die in it
and if they who are employed carrying it on en
gage in it, not from the motives of defendin
their country, liberty, property, life, &c.; but for
buſineſs, and wiſh not to have peace, and pre
vent ſlaughters, but to multiply them, commi
as many murders as they occaſion deaths, &c.

4*thly*, Duelling is the moſt outrageous mad
neſs, and daring preſumptuous wickedneſs, t
ruſh into the preſence of God and eternity in
furious ſtate of wrath and revenge like devils
and thus to plunge into eternal fire and dark
neſs, in the infernal regions with them. It i
argued, that honour requires it, and courage i
diſplayed in it; but it is juſt the contrary: tru
honour conſiſts only with the rules of virtue an
religion; and murder is no virtue, much leſs ſelf
murder, but the greateſt baſeneſs and meanneſ
None has a right to take away life but he tha
gave it, except in ſelf-defence, which is the caſ
in lawful war; and that of criminals, is the de
fence of ſociety, and not by any arbitrary powe
and right that a ſovereign magiſtrate or gover
nor has.

Honour is a ſenſe of intereſt and dignity, t
ſupport liberty, life, and property; and tru
courage can brave and bid defiance to mean in
ſults as below notice; and the neglect or ſilen
contempt of things that injure not perſon, cha
racter, or intereſt, which are puniſhable by law
is the greateſt courage and victory. Rage an
revenge, fooliſhly expoſing a life that God gave
is a madneſs; it is low and baſe, and like th

easts of prey. Its great to overlook and forgive. Revenge we ſtill do find, the weakeſt paſſion of a feeble mind.

5thly, Divination, *i. e.* fortune-telling, or boothſaying, are contrary to the laws of piety, and imply a diſtruſt in providence; not waiting patiently to ſee what providence will bring to paſs: it is a falſe pretence to prophecy, and diabolical lying, like the heathen oracles of old. See on Deiſm. As alſo Legerdemain, or Witchcraft, *i. e.* ſpecious, but falſe ſhew of miracles; being certain tricks done by ſecret arts, or ſlight of hand; which idolaters of old practiſed to lead people from the true God to falſe ones, pretending they did theſe by the power of their gods, for this is the meaning of witchcraft in ſcripture, and of the original words.

Among other nations it ſignified the art of ſecretly conveying poiſon by meat, cloathes, &c. The modern notions of inflicting torments at a diſtance, and of changing their ſhapes to that of other creatures, and transferring ſecretly the good of their commodities, are abſurd; they ſaid the devil could as well create as transform a creature.

Theſe and the doctrine of apparitions, ghoſts, fairies, &c. are contrary to reaſon, philoſophy, and common ſenſe, and trouble no philoſophers or wiſe men; though they are ſtill very troubleſome to others, and perhaps will be to the end of the world. They were propagated by mercenary beings, who deviſed and publiſhed ſuch notions that alarm the weak, for gain.

Games of chance and lottery are alſo impious,

as they are an appeal to the Deity to decide the matter, which is like taking his name in vain in common converſation. The philoſopher's rule is, Never appeal to a God for a trifle, or make a God appear, but for a matter worthy of a God. See Monſieur Placette ſur les jeux d' hazard, & la morale chretienne.

6thly, Luxury and ſelfiſhneſs are contrary to the laws of temperance and moderation; benevolence and liberality, generoſity, charity, *&c.* Thus, the covetous and rich amaſs treaſure, and expend it in extravagance and vanity; as in ſumptuous living, furniture, dreſs, and equipage; uſing fine commodities, and many varieties of meats and drinks; and thus are loaded with ſuperfluities, while others want the common neceſſaries, and pine in hunger, thirſt, and cold, or are oppreſſed with hard labour and painful toil. Some wear gaudy apparel, while others are cloathed in rags.

A community of goods, indeed, would encourage the ſlothful and extravagant, and prevent induſtry. The caſe was different with the Chriſtians in times of perſecution, and the Spartan ſtate, *&c.* But for ſome to abound in wealth, yea, and be encumbered with luxury and ſuperfluity, to feaſt till they are a burden to themſelves with corpulency, and out of ſhape, is ſhameful; and to monopolize their wealth, and not communicate liberally to the neceſſities of the poor and needy, is directly contrary to the great laws of love, pity, compaſſion, *&c.* and ſhew a cruel hardneſs of heart, that cannot feel another's woe or relieve them from it; but inſtead of being

pitied, the poor are only deſpiſed, as the Spectator obſerves, as if it were a crime to be poor, or as if riches were a virtue and poverty a vice. The moſt worthleſs wretch is careſſed if he be rich, and the moſt deſerving deſpiſed if he be poor, whereas poverty is no body's choice but enthuſiaſt's. This conduct is contrary to the command of the great Author of all, and ingratitude for his goodneſs; it is injuſtice to their brethren, children of the ſame common parent. Nature produces enough of proviſion for all her children, but ſome rob others of their ſhare; theſe think what they poſſeſs is their own, and that they may do what they will with it, and ſpend it, not only in vanity, luxury, ſuperfluity, &c. but in groſs wickedneſs, as drunkenneſs, and the gratification of their luſts; and become like beaſts or devils, as the concupiſcible or irraſcible appetites are gratified, and the ſenſual or diabolic vices practiſed. But they are only ſtewards of what they poſſeſs for the good of others, Pſal. xxiv. 1. lxxv. 6,—9. and muſt give an account of it.

To give to the poor is to return it to the Author, or lend to the Lord, and ſend bills of exchange to heaven, as a certain author expreſſes it, and death will deprive them of all, Pſal. xlix. 17. The Heathens ſaid, that all the poor and ſtrangers were ſent from Jupiter with a commiſſion to get a portion of the goods he entruſted to the rich; that their neceſſity was their commiſſion. The two chief Chriſtian virtues are hoſpitality to ſtrangers, and charity to the needy; and none can be poſſeſſed of real piety that want

theſe fruits of it, 1 John iii. 17. The neglecting to do good when in our power, involves us in the guilt of the oppoſite evil, which we had in our power to prevent, and did not. It is the bleſſing of providence that makes to proſper, Deut. viii. 18. and the curſe blaſts all our endeavours. They act directly contrary to the laws of Chriſt, as well as of humanity, that relieve not the diſtreſſed; and are neither men nor Chriſtians, having forfeited a title to both. The apoſtle does not ſay, How dwelleth the love of his brother in him that hath no bowels of compaſſion, but, How dwells the love of God in him; leſt he might perhaps have thought he had the love of God, though he had not brotherly love, John iv. 21. iii. 17.

How great is the promiſe and encouragement to the feeling heart and liberal hand! Pſal. xli. Nothing can be more beautiful and ſtrong. It is ſhameful to ſee many have over-much, and others not enough to ſupply their neceſſities. God has given ſome riches, in order to exerciſe the virtue of liberality, charity, &c. and others are poor, that they may exerciſe patience. If all that have enough and to ſpare, beſides furniſhing themſelves with neceſſary things, would ſupply the needy in their neighbourhood, or that are within the reach of their knowledge and ability, then they might all be relieved and ſupplied.

A certain good man, a citizen of the world, uſed to eat his meals with ill reliſh, conſidering how many were in want, and, with the moſt ſenſible pleaſure, imparted a ſhare to any at hand.

The poet expreſſes himſelf in a moving manner on this ſubject:

Ah! little think the gay licentious proud, *&c.*
Thomſon's Winter, l. 385.

It is the higheſt pleaſure to do a good office, Job xxix. xxx. xxxi. chapters, and it is God-like to relieve the diſtreſſed. Job could not eat his morſel alone, but gave a part thereof to the needy. Glorious promiſes are made to ſuch; and wealth otherwiſe is a curſe, Luke xvi. 19. With-holding the needy's portion is covetouſneſs, theft, and robbery. The favour of heaven will ſmile upon the merciful, ſweeten their enjoyments, increaſe their ſubſtance, and bleſs their poſterity; and otherwiſe, the frowns and curſe of heaven will embitter their enjoyments, and blaſt their ſubſtance. In the body-politic every member ſhould feel or ſuffer with, and relieve another, as in the natural body, if it be not benumb'd.

7thly, Idleneſs is contrary to the law of induſtry. Every member of ſociety ought to have ſome calling or buſineſs, elſe he is uſeleſs to ſociety, or an encumbrance to it; idleneſs is the nurſe of vice. To ſay one is idle, is perhaps in the ſtrongeſt terms, to ſay he is vicious; for man is an active being, and muſt be employed in deviſing, or practiſing either good or evil; and he who employs all his time in doing good, will have none to employ in doing evil.

It was a capital crime in ſome antient kingdoms, to want a buſineſs. And the Turks are bound every one to have a buſineſs, even the grand Signior himſelf. A late one was a knotch-

maker, he made knotches to bows. Idleneſs, as well as luxury or extravagance, beget poverty. In theſe ſtates where every one was obliged to have a buſineſs, and not to neglect it, but be diligent in it, there were few poor to be burdenſome, and ſtill fewer beggars, and no robbers; as there were officers of ſtate to take account of people's employments, &c.; and when there were public works for thoſe that did not get private buſineſs enough to live by, this prevented unneceſſary poor, that could labour, but could not get employment. In ſome places, they think he is a gentleman that has no buſineſs; ſo that if one aſk, What is ſuch a man's buſineſs? it is anſwered, He is a gentleman, that is, an idleman, but it is quite the contrary. It was a ſaying amongſt the Jews, He that did not teach his ſon a trade, taught him to ſteal.

8*thly*, Another great iniquity and diſorder, which is the hurt, and ſometimes the ruin of the public, is, that intereſt and friends procure emoluments and employments, and *merit* is not encouraged. This is contrary to the laws of equity and juſtice. Thus great patrons, and powerful friends, or money, will procure poſts under government, and military offices, without ſkill, courage, or experience, to the deſtruction of armies, or the loſs of a country; and it is ſo not only in civil and military offices, but in eccleſiaſtic ones, and in colleges and ſeminaries of learning; thus thoſe that have neither parts nor learning, nor a method of teaching or communicating, get in, to mar the progreſs of education, or prevent the youth's being rightly inſtructed and

prepared for public offices; while others, well qualified for ſuch offices and employments, can be of no uſe to the public, for want of an opportunity to diſplay their merit, which is loſt to the public, and of no advantage to themſelves. The education of youth, and the right inſtruction of mankind, is of the utmoſt importance; and yet theſe that have neither ability, nor a method, nor the powers of ſpeech, are often impoſed on the public. Now ſuch as beſtow benefices in the church, from friendſhip, and intereſt, and not according to merit, commit the worſt ſimony. In antient times, merit alone was a recommendation; thus the moſt ſkilful ſoldier, &c. was preferred; the contrary is the hurt, or ruin of the public good.

CONCLUSION.

I HAVE now finiſhed what I propoſed; and in ſuch an extenſive field, amidſt ſuch a vaſt variety, if ſome inaccuracies are to be found, it is no more than what might be expected. Beſides, the connection of ideas, and the thread of reaſoning was broken by ſeveral interruptions and diſadvantages; and as the preſs began as ſoon as I had the materials provided, being hard occupied to keep it going, I had not time to attend to ſtyle; ſo that the phraſeology will ſometimes be inaccurate, and not elegant; but ſuch a thing can hardly be expected in a compoſition of this kind, where the train of an argument may require long or abrupt ſentences, as attention muſt chiefly be payed to ſentiment and argument. Miſtakes in hiſtory and chronology,

are not to be aſcribed to me, but my authors; and amidſt ſuch a diverſity, I was in doubt ſometimes which to follow.

I ſet up as a patron for no party, but for truth alone. I intended juſtice to all, by acknowledging their properties; and alſo to truth, and their own intereſt, in order to reform them, by pointing out their faults; which my ſenſe of the dignity of reaſon and religion made a painful taſk to me. As I was thus obliged to act the part of a critic, or judge, I conſidered that juſtice knows no favourites, nor any difference between friends and enemies; in this reſpect it was painted blind, that it might not ſee the parties, but only hear the cauſe; and this alſo recalled to my mind, what the poet ſays to judges,

Dare ye condemn the righteous cauſe!
Have ye forgot, or never knew,
That God will judge the judges too?
Dr Watts's verſion of Pſal. lviii.

If any party, (and there are too many ſuch,) think they have few or no faults, and their oppoſites have few or no properties, and that I have not exerciſed an impartial juſtice towards them, they muſt refer the matter to neutral judges; and if ſuch are not diſpoſed to correct their miſtakes, but to defend them, they will give occaſion to a more particular delineation of them. Conſider, Prov. xxviii. 13. Gal. iv. 16. Though I have been obliged to ſome learned and judicious friends, for their obſervations, before it went to the preſs, yet I ſhall ſtill reckon my-

ſelf obliged to others, for their remarks, that the next edition may be improved by them. I diſclaim bigotry, or, in other words, infallibility, and immutability, and am open to conviction; and have no principles ſo fixed, but I am ready to change them when I ſee reaſon for it; and whatever miſtakes or errors I may have committed, they were not intended *. I ſhall conclude

* It is diſputed, whether the hypocrite, or the open profane, is the greateſt enemy to religion, or does the moſt hurt to it; but the bigot does more hurt to it, by his bitter ſpirit, and furious zeal, than the hypocrite, the ſceptic, and the profligate, altogether; there is no medium between moderation and madneſs. A bigot is a barbarian; bigotry cauſed not only ſchiſm, but perſecution, the utmoſt degree of madneſs, and profaneneſs too, by raiſing a diſguſt at religion. See Dr Watts's Orthodoxy and Charity united in Gentle Moderation, without Indifference, Phil. iv. 5. It is a ſchiſm from the great law of moderation, the golden medium, and ſafe way; and contrary to the royal laws of charity and humility, the ſoul of Chriſtianity. Though charity rejoiceth in the truth, yet it hopeth the beſt, and ſees the properties of others; but bigotry ſees only their faults, and that not to lament them, but rejoice in them; it is a canker worm, that conſumes charity, the marrow and life of religion, Matth. vii. 4.; it is worſe than ſcepticiſm, as it diſturbs the peace of others, though honeſt inquirers for truth; and it prevents further diſcoveries. One would have thought Mark ix. 38. ſufficient to cure all party-bigotry, John xiii. 35. Charity is more ready to ſee wherein others agree than wherein they differ, and to rejoice when it finds any agreement; and humility is more ready to ſee its own faults than thoſe of others. Bigotry ſprings from pride, malice, &c. weakneſs, or the want of ſenſe and judgment. See Luciferians, P. 115.

with annexing the concluſion of my philoſophical deſcription of the different ſoils, (*i. e.* caſts of mind,) for nouriſhing different principles and religions. Half thinking, half learned, half-enlightened, volatile, or narrow minds, that are unable, or unwilling, to think and conſider, examine and view things rightly, or at all; having their eyes diſeaſed, or their minds purblinded by ignorance, prejudice, partiality, pride, ſelf-conceit, old cuſtom, faſhion; or, on the contrary, by levity, vanity, curioſity, deſire of novelty, ſingularity, contention, oppoſition, ambition, covetouſneſs, licentious diſpoſitions and practices; are ſoils fit to nouriſh all kinds of infidelity, and hereſy, &c. as materialiſm, idealiſm, phanaticiſm, atheiſm, ſcepticiſm, enthuſiaſm, deiſm, idolatry, Paganiſm, Mahometaniſm, modern Judaiſm, ſuperſtition, perſecution, profaneneſs, ſchiſm, Socinianiſm, Solifidianiſm, &c. And in their philoſophical, theological, and literary wars, fight only with creatures of their own fancies; when contending with truth, reaſon, and revelation, the conſtitution of nature, the preſent providential ſtate of the world, the moral government of the univerſe, or the conduct of providence, &c.; they contend only with hideous ſpectres, and monſtrous metamorphoſed apparitions, the creatures of a diſordered imagination, framed by the prejudice of education and ill humours. Half a machine ſeems monſtrous to novices.

21 JY 64

A little learning is a dangerous thing,
Dip deep, or taſte not, the Pierian ſpring;
For ſhallow draughts intoxicate the brain,
But drinking deep will ſober it again.

CONTENTS.

(N. B. *The titles of the Topics and Articles were neglected to be marked in the pages referred to.*)

	Page		Page
General introduction,	10	The Quakers,	253
Paganiſm,	15	The Moravians,	258
Atheiſm,	28	M'Millanites, and Seceders,	259
Deiſm,	33	Relief,	271
Mahometaniſm,	48	Methodiſts,	286
Judaiſm,	59	Antinomianiſm, and its various branches,	287
Modern Judaiſm,	68	Perſecution,	294
Chriſtianity,	77	Slavery,	296
The Trinity,	85	Wars,	297
The Apoſtolics, 124,	260	Duelling,	298
The Greek Church,	128	Divination,	299
Church of Rome,	131	Luxury,	300
Reformed Church,	176	Idleneſs,	303
Church of England,	192	Attention to merit the Intereſt of the Public,	304
Church of Scotland,	197	Concluſion,	305
Church-Government,	20.		
The Arminians,	235		
Anabaptiſts,	245		
Nudi and Anarchites,	253		

INDEX.

	Page
Abelites,	83
Abſolution,	156
Academics,	126
Agreements,	15, 128, 183, &c.
Angels how fell,	21
Anthropomorphiſts,	120
Arians,	85
Albigenſes,	123
Barchochab,	113
Bigotry,	4, 307
Brutes, reaſon of	10
Burial, modes of	17
Canonical,	9
Centuries,	112
Children, names of	18
Church true, what	180
Cicero on the gods,	25
Confeſſions,	155, 183
Covenants,	242, 262
Creation,	25, 30
Cuſtom,	6
Deſcartes,	26
Differences,	18, 25, &c.
Donatiſts,	115
Dort,	136
Doxology,	197
Education,	6, 12
Egypt, burials of	17
Enthuſiaſm,	6, 253
Epicureans,	26
Eſſenes,	72
Evil, origin of	20
Fall, how	21
Fataliſts,	32
Figure,	41
Gelaſius,	109
Gods, &c.	19, 93
Golden age,	20
Good and evil,	ibid.
Greece, burials of	17
Heathens, ſtate of	36
Heavenly bodies,	27
Hebrew,	96
Herodians,	71
Hereſy,	9, 30
Holy rituals,	64
Huſs,	126
Idolatry,	25
Jews,	76
Immutability,	20
Indulgences,	157
Inſtitutions,	41, 60
Laconic taſte,	7
Lent,	158
Light of nature,	33
Liturgies,	187, 193

	Page
Magians,	23
Magic,	38
Manichees	19
Merits,	145, 155
Miracle, what	36
Meſſaleans,	115
Moderation,	13
Monophyſites,	109
Monothelites,	ibid
Myſtery,	42
Nazarites,	68, 73
Novatians,	114
Offerings, what	62
Oracles,	36
Orthodoxy,	9
Paradiſe,	60
Pelagius,	116
Phariſees,	69
Patriarchal,	62
Plato,	23
Perſians,	19
Peripatetics,	26
Prejudice,	6, 11
Polemics,	4, 7
Pyrrho,	5
Proſpect,	12
Prophecy,	37
Poets,	19
Pythagoras,	18
Penance,	154, 163
Pope,	117, 136
Popiſh errors,	131
Praxeas errors,	113
Predeſtination,	136
Prayer,	188
Prieſt's robes,	64
Pſalmody,	198
Purgatory,	167
Quietiſts,	125
Revelation,	18, 33
Repentance,	150
Rites,	65
Rules,	11, 100
Sabeans,	23
Sabellius,	114
Sacrifices,	62
Sacraments,	146, 158
Sadducees,	70
Samoſatenus,	110
Samaritans,	74
Satan,	61
Scepticiſm,	5
Schiſm,	9, 177
Sect,	9
Socinus,	86
Simon Magus,	110
Sin, original	243
Socrates,	18
Stoics,	ibid
Temple,	65
Tree of knowledge,	61
Tindal,	45
Vadois, or Waldenſes,	123
Wickliff,	125
Will free,	238

Errors of the Preſs.

In the title-page, line 16. *for* in errare, *read* in errore. p. 9. l. 16. for xxv. r. xxiv. l. 18. dele Jude ver. 6. p. 16. l. 1. before trees ſupl. as l. 2. after which ſupl. two laſt. p. 25. l. 11. before ſepulchres ſupl. over. p. 33. l. 25. for impoſſible r. poſſible. p. 35. l. 4. from the foot, before divine ſupl. analogy of the. p. 49. l. laſt, for 124 r. 114. p. 53. l. 25. dele had, and add old before world. p. 61 l. 14. for man r. men, l. 27. for Rom. vi. r. xvi. p. 63. l. 12. dele and. p. 65. l. 15. for tabernacled r. tabernacles, l. 22. for 6. r. 5. p. 68. l. 2. for Lam. vi. r. iv. p. 79. l. 5. from the foot, for iii. r. xiii. p. 85. l. 25. for ſecit r. fecit. p. 94. l. 4. from the foot, for ſenſe r. eſſence. p. 102. l. 11. after ſpeak ſupl. only. l. 6. from the foot, for 1 Cor. r. 2 Cor. p. 103. l. 12. from the foot, for xix. r. 19. p. 115. l. 7. from the foot, for 100 r. 200. p. 147. l. 16. for xix. r. 19. p. 169. l. 6. for beſt r. laſt. p. 210. l. 15. for Pſal. r. Phil. l. 17. for 1 Tim. r. 2 Tim. p. 250. l. 32. dele if. p. 251 l 5. for 23 r. 25. p. 269. l. 14. for gives r. raiſes. p. 271. l. 3. for chief r. father. p. 278. l. laſt, for xxxiii. r. xxiii. p. 279. l. 8. for xxxii. r. xxiii.

21 JY 64

F I N I S.